

3 1761 02079741 1

MANUEL




THE LIBRARY
of
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY
Toronto

~ Davidson Esq
with the regards
Es.

Bunbury
Septm 27th 1901







MODERN UNIVERSALISM

AND

MATERIALISM,

AS VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF

HOLY SCRIPTURE,

BY

THE REV. EDWARD SOFTLEY, B. D.

WITH INTRODUCTION BY

THE REV. W. CAVEN, D. D.,
PRINCIPAL OF KNOX'S COLLEGE, TORONTO.

TORONTO:
ROWSELL & HUTCHISON, PRINTERS.

1879.

X
941
63
162

MMANUEL

Entered according to Act of Parliament of Canada, in the year 1879, by Reverend
EDWARD SOFTLEY, in the office of the Minister of Agriculture.

DEC 5 1949

TO

THE RIGHT REV. I. HELLMUTH, D.D., D.C.L.,

LORD BISHOP OF HURON,

THIS VOLUME IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED,

BY

THE AUTHOR.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.—MODERN UNIVERSALISM.

PART 1.

Negative Universalism, as represented by the Rev. H. N. Oxenham, in his pamphlet, “Is the received Doctrine *De Fide*? and, if not, Is it true?”

Mr. Oxenham’s questions answered seriatim.

PART 2.

Positive Universalism, as represented by Revs. S. Cox and A. Jukes, in “Salvator Mundi,” and “The Restitution of all Things.”

CHAP. 1.—Analytical Synopsis.

- “ 2.—Process of Investigation.
- “ 3.—Laws of Scripture Exegesis.
- “ 4.—First Born and First Fruits. Negative View.
- “ 5.—Law of Election and True Function of Punishment.
- “ 6.—First Born and First Fruits. Positive View.
- “ 7.—Revelation and Moral Agency.
- “ 8.—Restitution of all Things. Scripture Teaching.

BOOK II.—MODERN MATERIALISM, as represented by the Rev. Edward White, in “Life in Christ.”

CHAP. 1.—Introductory chapter, with notice of the Geological and Biological argument.

- “ 2.—Immortality of the Soul and Philosophy.
- “ 3.—Fall of Man and Terms of the Curse.

CHAP. 4.—Crucial words, “Life” and “Death.”

“ 5.—Death of Christ, as related to the “Death”; the Curse of Sin.

“ 6.—*Usus Loquendi* of the Sacred Writers, and Hebraisms of the New Testament.

“ 7.—Figurative Description of Future Punishment.

“ 8.—Literal Terms.

“ 9.—Of Probation in Hades.

Collateral Issues involved in Mr. White’s book :—

- (a) Nature of God.
- (b) Nature of Sin.
- (c) Character of Regeneration.
- (d) Atonement of Christ.
- (e) Inspiration of the Scriptures.
- (f) Prayers for the Dead.

A.—Comparative View of Universalism and Materialism.

B.—The Modern *Via Media*, as represented by Prof. Birks.

C.—Positive Results.

- (a) Proximate, and as related to Future Punishment.
- (b) Ultimate, and as related to Christian Theism.

APPENDIX.

- (a) Synopsis of Mr. Carry’s Article on *aiōn*.
- (b) Excursus on the Rise of Moral Evil.
- (c) Excursus on the Trichotomy Theory.

PREFACE.

In offering the following pages, through the public, and through the Church catholic, to that Church's Divine Head with a view to vindicate His Revealed Word, the author would say a few words, in reference thereto, by way of explanation, (he will not term it apology,) to the reader.

That explanation is as follows :—

It was not with the ambition of writing a book, that the first, and part of the second portion of this treatise was written.

In the performance of what he regarded as a duty of obedience to his ordination vows, and of fulfilment of his obligations as a minister of Christ, to endeavour "to drive away, all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word"; he took up his pen at that time, and sought the aid and avenue of the religious press, in the prosecution of such endeavour.


Continued enquiry on his part, and the further development of Rationalistic principles by others, in this direction, finally led him to think, not of a pamphlet, but of a book; and the dimensions of the same, have, by the same cause, been further enlarged. In the belief that the endeavour, as it has for its object, that which is of supreme consequence to man,

and of glory to God; has also, in its inception and progress, been favoured with tokens of the Divine presence and help; the author has been encouraged to persevere, in a work of some little labour. In doing so, he has been greatly assisted and cheered, by the kindness of many able and eminent men, who have passed so very favourable a judgment, upon such portions of his work as came under their knowledge; that he has had his hands greatly strengthened thereby, and by the consideration of which, he has often been reassured. The reception which he has met with, from his clerical brethren, in his personal intercourse with them, in connection herewith; has been of a most cheering and gratifying character, and has afforded great satisfaction to him, as it has given evidence of the general orthodoxy, and true catholicity of the Church in Canada; as its several parts stand related to each other, and to their Divine Head.

While he most gratefully appreciates the kindness, and reciprocates the love, of all the dear brethren in Christ, before referred to; he feels constrained to make special acknowledgment, of the prompt and cordial help, of Provost Whitaker, Rev. A. Sanson, Dr. Potts, Dr. Robb, Professor McLaren, Archdeacon (now Bishop) Sweatman; of the marked kindness of his valued friend, and honoured brother, Principal Caven, who has written the Introduction, and whose interest in the work has been unceasing; and though last, not least, of the valuable help of his friend of many years, the Rev. J. M. Cameron.

It has been the endeavour of the author, to serve the cause of the Master herein, "as of the ability that He giveth"; and also, to justify their favourable opinions. That they will cover its blemishes, for this reason, with the mantle of love, and that, for whatever it may be accounted worthy of praise, all honour may be given to the Lord, and Giver of All, is the wish of the Church's humble servant, for the Master's sake.

THE AUTHOR.



INTRODUCTION

BY

THE REV. W. CAVEN, D.D.,

PRINCIPAL OF KNOX COLLEGE, TORONTO.

It is not necessary to say anything regarding the importance of the questions discussed in the following volume. All that relates to man's condition after death is invested with the deepest interest; and the human mind cannot cease—with hope or with fear—to contemplate the endless future.

We have no certain knowledge of the future state except as we receive it from the Word of God. The question as to the very existence of man after death cannot be answered with certainty by any authority but the Bible; and whatever conscience may say respecting a scene of retribution, it is the inspired Word which completes the evidence that it shall be well with the righteous, and ill with the wicked.

Much speculation has of late been indulged in, and a good deal written, regarding the future condition of those who die without a holy character. Many persons are maintaining that the wicked shall cease to exist at death; or that, though raised up at the last day, their existence and their punishment shall both

terminate in the second death ; or that, after a period of discipline, longer or shorter, they shall attain to faith in Christ, and become partakers of redemption ; and thus all men shall be saved.

The views entertained on these momentous questions must necessarily exercise a great influence upon the other opinions, and upon the life, of any man ; and it cannot be an unimportant service to the Church of Christ, to subject the whole matter to a careful and thorough examination, in the light of Scripture. Such service the author of the present work has sought to render. Mr. Softley's treatise is not only opportune in its appearance, but is characterized (we feel sure that fair-minded readers will ratify this judgment) by profound reverence for the teachings of the Word of God, by clearness and good method in the treatment of the several topics, and by able and exhaustive examination of the arguments adduced, whether by Restorationists, or by those who adopt the theory of "Life in Christ." The book, moreover, is kindly and sympathetic in its tone, and no one can doubt that the writer is earnestly and prayerfully seeking to guide his readers in the path of truth and peace.

We are satisfied that there is really need for such a work as Mr. Softley has here produced ; and our hope is, that it may be used by Him whose glory it is written to advance, for the vindication of His truth, the resolving of doubts on the part of those who are uncertain what Scripture teaches, and the further establishment in the faith of all by whom these pages shall be read.

MODERN UNIVERSALISM
AND
MATERIALISM,
AS VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF
HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BOOK I.
MODERN UNIVERSALISM.

PART I.

Negative Universalism, as represented by the Rev. H. N. Oxenham, in his pamphlet, "Is the received doctrine De Fide, and if not, is it true"?

In discussing the modern objections to the received doctrine concerning Future Punishment, I follow the order in which I have been led to examine them, before collecting the results of such examination into the present form. I do so, because it is here, both fitting and convenient. Before considering the questions proposed by Mr. Oxenham, and which questions he proceeds to solve in harmony with the Restorationist.

theory, I wish to say a few words on his letter to Mr. Gladstone. That letter sufficiently indicates the bias of the writer—an important matter in connection with the questions offered.

He quotes from a writer in the "Contemporary Review," who proposes that the doctrines of Original Sin, Imputed Righteousness, the *legend* of the Fall, and the Story of the Incarnation, together with Baptismal Regeneration, Eternal Punishment, the Trinity, and the Atonement, be allowed gently to fall into the shade, as mysteries which it is vain to seek to penetrate, and, regarding which, *silence* is our least injurious, and most respectful course. This, it is true, Mr. Oxenham does not approve of, *in full*: notably with reference to the Incarnation; but it indicates the school to which he belongs, and *how far* he is at present prepared to go in furtherance of Modern Rationalism.

A few words also, on his "Statement of Doctrine."

(a) He objects to the doctrine that there is "no place for repentance, or amendment beyond the grave, and that such amendment, if possible, will be futile," because it seems to imply a charge against God of "amazing cruelty and injustice."

There is indeed an admitted possibility that we are unable to judge aright upon these subjects; but if so, why this charge against God as cruel and unjust? Whereas God has given us a sufficient period of probation and grace upon earth, *why* may He from the standpoint of faith in a Divine Revelation, be considered even seemingly cruel and unjust, because that probation is *confined* to earth?

(b) He objects to the doctrine that the torments of the lost will never end, because it implies a failure to a very great extent, in a purpose to redeem mankind, the which, he says, God had designed before the foundation of the world.

This, however, entirely depends upon what is deduced from the general teaching of Scripture upon this head. It is plainly inconsistent with universal salvation ; but *not* with the Scripture statement that Christ laid down his life for the sheep ; (John 10: 15,) that He loved the church, and gave Himself for it; (Eph. 5: 26,) nor with the doctrine that He will justify and save those who accept of the terms of His salvation.

(c) He objects to the doctrine that the majority of men will be lost, because that good will never finally overcome evil, but be everlasting with it.

To this however, it may be said, that it is a doctrine of Divine Revelation, that God did not help the angels that sinned ; and we have not the slightest intimation of their forgiveness, or repentance in the future ; is it therefore more impossible to believe that He will punish with eternal misery, persistently wicked and unbelieving *men*, after a fitting period of probation and grace, seeing that in either case the *same objection* will remain ?

In short, the whole of his objections are open to the same charge, which he lays against the received and orthodox doctrine, on this subject, viz. : that *he* interprets Scripture to suit *his* preconceived opinions.

The plenary inspiration, and authority of Holy Scripture, being received as a fact, these is no more

difficulty in receiving the doctrine of *eternal* punishment, than that of punishment for an indefinitely protracted, although limited period. The fact appears to be, that Mr. Oxenham and the school to which he belongs, are strongly inclined to judge of Divine Revelation, and of the Divine Being, by their own standard of right and wrong, and not by His, and as a natural consequence, wish to make both to agree with their own theory.

There can be no doubt, that a want of belief, cordial and entire, in the full inspiration and authority of the Bible, as the alone rule of faith and practice, is at the root of the whole difficulty. We can admit all the enquiry within just bounds, that "modern science," and fair criticism may suggest; but the premises referred to, must, in order to any legitimate argument, be fully maintained.

God *is*; and the Bible reveals Him.

The only just enquiry is, "what saith the Lord *therein*?"

The questions proposed by Mr. Oxenham are six in number.

The First is, with respect to *aiώνιος*: "does it necessarily mean everlasting"?

The Second, "Is there any other word used in Scripture with reference to the destiny of the wicked, that has this necessary and invariable meaning"?

Mr. Oxenham, I think, should have inverted the order, if the latter word has any bearing upon the argument, with reference to the punishment of *men*. That it has such a bearing, we are assured by our Lord

Himself, when He says that the wicked shall “depart into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.” Devils, and persistently wicked men, we are assured by Holy Scripture, shall have a common doom. Therefore, whatever just interpretation may be put upon that passage in which *ἀΐδιος* refers to the devils, must have an important bearing upon the future destiny of *men*, and must be considered first. By a manifestly incorrect exegesis of the passage in Jude 6, *ἀΐδιος* is made to mean *until*, and also a material form given to the “chains,” there spoken of, which is not in keeping with the circumstances referred to. The passage treats of the *sin* of the angels, “who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation,” and for this reason, they are “reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day.”

St. Peter, speaking of the same matter, terms them “chains of darkness.” That this is figurative language, none can doubt. Sin is frequently, in Holy Scripture, termed a cord or band. So Solomon says, Prov. 5 : 22, “His own iniquities shall take the wicked himself, and he shall be holden in the cords of his sins.” Our own Liturgy also makes use of this simile: “We are tied and bound with the chain of our sins.”

The chains or bonds spoken of in relation to Satan, are of three kinds:—

First, with respect to his unalterable character, our Lord says: “He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar and the father of it.”—John 8 : 44.

From this we learn, that since his fall, to sin, is with him a necessity ; as he is unable, because unchangeably *unwilling*, to do aught else. This, it appears, is a necessary consequence of his sin, and also of those spirits connected with him in his rebellion.

But, Secondly, the devils are bound by the special power of God upon them, and are limited in their ability to do evil to men.

Thirdly, by a similar moral power of conscience, they are bound, as *expecting* and awaiting their inevitable and merited doom.

It is noticeable here, how there is a similar language used, both with respect to the bonds wherewith Satan and persistently sinful men are bound, and also with respect to their continuance.

Both St. Peter and St. Jude, in speaking of reprobates and apostates, say, that “blackness of darkness,” (Jude 3), and “the mist of darkness,” (2 Peter 2 : 4,) “is reserved for them for ever”; while our Saviour speaks of the “everlasting fire, ($\tau\hat{\omega} \pi\nu\rho \tau\hat{\omega} \alpha\lambda\nu\nu\nu$) prepared for the devil and his angels,” as their common portion.

But, it will be proper now to remark upon the grammatical meaning of the phrase, in the passage Jude 6. The “everlasting chains under darkness,” are $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \kappa\rho\iota\sigma\nu\nu$ $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\varsigma \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$. Mr. Oxenham renders this, “until the judgment of the great day.” Winer, in his “Grammar of the New Testament Diction, tells us, sec. 53 (c), that $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ with the accusative, when transferred to internal relations or in a tropical use (which is evidently the case here), is used of every object, and aim, of the

measure to which something rises, the state into which it passes, or of the result."

I should render it here, of the *result*, particularly. Thus, St. Paul says Rom. 10: 20, "with the heart, man believeth unto (*εἰς*) righteousness," So, here, of the devils, they are bound by their sinful nature and its actings, *εἰς*, unto, the *κρίσις*, or condemnation, of the great day. In the former passage, *δικαιοσύνη* may be rendered justification, which makes the analogy more perfect. But, of the *aim*, and *purpose*, as having relation to the power of God, by which their ability to do evil is limited, or restrained, we may find a parallel passage in 2 Pet. 3: 7, where he says, "The heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word, are kept in store, reserved unto fire, against (*εἰς*), the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men."

Of course I only quote this as a grammatical parallel.

Thus, having ascertained, first, that their bonds are of a *spiritual*, and secondly of an *eternal* character, and thirdly, that the word *εἰς*, translated "unto," is continuative from, and not terminative with the day of judgment, but expresses both a purpose of God in relation thereto, and a certain result connected with their state of sin; and having also seen that the same *κρίσις* which awaits them, awaits wicked men, and that their doom is the same; and that as the word *αἰδίος* does indisputably mean everlasting; *therefore*, it most certainly applies both to the judgment awaiting the devils, and awaiting wicked men.

Another important consideration, confirmatory of this conclusion, is the fact of the *unchanged enmity* of

the devils to the throne of God, even to the end, (see Rev. 12 : 12-17) so that if the bonds wherewith they are bound *anterior* to the last day, be of an eternal character, we cannot conceive that there will be any mitigation of their punishment, *continuative from thence*; and also it must legitimately affect the meaning of that word, by which the duration of their punishment is afterwards expressed.

2. We now proceed to the second question, (properly,) “Does the word *aiώνιος* necessarily mean everlasting”?

The question here put is not, I think, a fair one, as its *order* in Mr. Oxenham’s pamphlet is not so, and the interpretation put upon the passage just considered, is not correct.

The question rather is, “What is the true mind of the sacred writers in this place, where *aiώνιος* is used in reference to Future Punishment, as viewed in connection with other passages in which the same subject is treated of, and particularly in connection with the word *άιδιος* ?”

We have seen that the doom of the evil angels, and of persistently evil men, is conjoined not only in the time of final sentence, but also in the terms by which that sentence is expressed. First, it is said of the evil angels, that they are “bound in everlasting chains, under darkness,” (Jude 6), and that they are “cast down to hell,” and delivered into chains of darkness to be reserved (*εἰς*) unto judgment. (2 Pet. 2 : 4,) At that day Christ will say unto wicked men, “Depart from me, ye cursed into everlasting fire, reserved for the devil, and his angels. Matt. 25 : 41 ; Rev. 20 : 10-15.

In other places (Jude 13, 2 Pet. 2 : 17,) we are told of wicked reprobates and apostates, that “ the blackness of darkness,” and the “ mist of darkness,” is reserved to them for them, for ever.

And now, what is the impression that we are to gain concerning the meaning of the whole ? The “ blackness of darkness,” expressly said to be reserved for wicked men, is precisely analogous to what St. Peter says of the condition of the wicked angels, anterior to the day of judgment. Of the one it is said, that they are reserved in chains of darkness ; of the other it is said, that blackness of darkness is reserved for them.

The only fair and reasonable conclusion that we can arrive at, is this : the future of wicked angels, and of wicked men, is in this respect similar in kind ; and as their doom is united, (see Rev. 20 : 10-15) similar also in duration, being in each case unchangeable. But when we are told of the everlasting fire, of which both shall be partakers, we must consider that another aspect of that punishment is presented to us. May we not say that it refers to place and circumstances ? As it is said of Judas that he went to his own place, (Acts 1 : 25,) so here ; and also that such points to, what Theologians term, *positive*, as distinguished from *natural* punishments ; the one proceeds from an unchangeable character, the other from correspondent and suitable inflictions awarded by the Most High.

But now with respect to the application of the word *aiώνιος*. *Schleusner*, quoted by Mr. Oxenham, says, that the reference of the term, is to be gathered from the nature of the subject, and the discourse of the

writer ; and so when it is conjoined with $\pi\hat{\nu}\rho$, $\kappa\hat{\lambda}\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$, and $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$, he himself renders it as meaning "eternal." This is only reasonable ; and when we consider man's condition with respect to knowledge of Divine things, and also as to God's uniform practice and method in revealing Himself and His purposes, it is the only just and reasonable conclusion. The word $\alpha\hat{\iota}\omega\eta\iota\varsigma$ confessedly, in all cases, means indefinite time ; the enquiry here may justly be : "Has God anywhere said that this punishment shall cease, or given the faintest hope of it doing so" ?

When we consider that this word expresses the punishment ultimately awarded to devils, as irreclaimably confirmed in their sin, have we any reason to suppose that God, who is inflexibly just, will be retrogressive to such in the duration of His punishments ? Have we not rather to expect that those punishments awarded at the great day will be cumulative, according to the settled malignity of their sin ?

This, I think, is conclusive of the whole matter, but another consideration is to be added. We are given to understand that none are finally condemned, until after trial and offer of mercy, and none until they have actually chosen death rather than life. Man's ultimate condemnation is not based upon one or many *acts* of sin, but upon a confirmed habit and character of wilful disobedience to known truth ; specially of refusal to believe in the Son of God. Of such it is said, that they "shall not see life, but the wrath of God *abideth* on them." Man's deliberate and final action upon the offer of a Saviour, marks him as ripe for weal or for woe.

He that is unjust is to remain unjust still, he that is filthy as filthy still, he that is righteous and holy shall remain so still, and the award of Jesus, in such connection, to every man will be, "according as his work shall be." (Rev. 22:11, 12.)

No intimation is given of subsequent modification or change, as indeed this utterance stands at the very *close* of the canon of Revealed Truth. It only remains to remark upon the two first questions, that the stability of the doctrine of the Eternity of Future Punishment is, in view of the premises considered, by no means impaired thereby; and also that the opinion of Bishop Wordsworth, to which Mr. Oxenham refers, is *only* an opinion, but so far as it goes, from its ambiguity of expression, may as well be understood of the received and orthodox belief.

The Third—"Is there any statement in Holy Scripture which must of necessity mean the popular doctrine?"

The question here put, is too exacting in its character, in view of the subject. The *object* of the author would appear to be, to require each passage referring to the subject, to fully express the whole doctrine, and (having, as he supposes, destroyed the evidence from the meaning of the words used to express eternity), so destroy the force of the evidence as a whole, by rejecting it in its several parts, in detail; whereas it is an important canon of interpretation that the subject matter, and the scope of a writer be duly considered. The more just enquiry is this:—Seeing that there is a word used in Holy Scripture, in connection with the

punishment of the wicked, which does certainly and indubitably mean endless, or eternal, does the general scope and tenor of the Holy Scripture go to corroborate the conclusion afforded thereby, that the punishment of persistently wicked men, will, like that of devils, be literally endless or eternal ?

If God has so ordained, that the punishment of the wicked shall be endless, it is reasonable to suppose that in some *one* place we may find decisive language to that effect ; it is but required, having found such testimony, that the general scope of the Sacred Writers shall be such as to *confirm* that conclusion. The passages, St. Matt. 12: 31, 32 ; St. Mark 3 : 28, and St. Luke 12 : 10, when compared with each other, lead us to this conclusion, viz., that there *is* a sin which cannot be forgiven, Neither the Law nor the Gospel makes any such provision ; for this no doubt is the reference in Matt. 12 : 32, where *τούτῳ τῷ αἰώνι* is connected with *τῷ μέλλοντι*. St. Mark says, “it shall *never* be forgiven.” St. Luke says, “it shall *not* be forgiven.” Here, also great weight is to be given to the fact, that all hope of forgiveness to the sinner, is, in the mind of the writer, confined to earth and time. These passages are to be compared with 1 St. John 5 : 16 : “There *is* a sin unto death.” Here, as in the passages before referred to, we learn that there is a sin resulting in *death* ; the one idea is expressed in all.

It would be sufficient for our argument, if this were confined to the particular sin referred to, but I take it also to mean, that the natural and necessary result, of chosen, malignant, and unrepented sin, as developed in

this life, is declared, after death, to be irremissible. St. John expresses this by death (*θάνατος*). There is no doubt that this refers to future punishment, the “second death,” or the “loss” of the soul.

Mr. Oxenham admits all that we can require, or the passages actually teach, save when he says, “that this while ‘endless,’ is entirely different from what we usually understand by everlasting punishment,” and “it is compatible with existence in heaven.”*

I think it is “generally understood” that the pains of hell and the joys of heaven (while each will be “endless”), will consist of both what is derived from character, and fitting circumstances appointed by God in accordance with character.

Severally considered, happiness and misery, in the

* The argument of Mr. Oxenham from the etymology of the word *ἀφίημι* is not justifiable from the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers, for we find it used as a convertible term with *ἰλάσκομαι*, which also means to forgive. Both in their etymological reference, are essentially connected with the Atonement of Christ, by whose sacrifice sin is taken away.

ἀφεσίς is the word generally used to express forgiveness, and we find the verb used, not only in the verse preceding, where our Lord says, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men ; (Matt. 12:31,) but also in the Lord’s Prayer, St. Matt. 6:12, and in St. John 1:9. The *antithesis* between *ἀφεθήσεται αντρῷ*, and *οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται*, is found in the removal of the punishment in the one case, by the imputation of Christ’s merits ; in the other, that there is no such removal, because to them Christ’s merits are not imputed.

This, of course, includes all the teaching of Scripture with reference to forgiveness. Where sin is pardoned of God, we are taught to believe that all its effects and consequences, material and moral, are ultimately fully removed.

The forgiveness of the believer, as a necessary consequence of his justification and trust in Christ, is full and complete, and in all its results will be perfectly disclosed at the day of judgment. The very opposite will be the case with the wicked, who will receive all the results of his unbelief.

future world, will be chiefly from character and society, and how "loss of capacity to know and love Him who is the Truth," is compatible with existence in heaven, where the people of Jesus Christ shall be "like Him," and "awake up after His likeness," I cannot learn from the Bible, nor can I conceive of. More especially when we are told that "there shall be no more curse," that the hunger and thirst after righteousness shall be satisfied, or "filled;" which leaves room for no *want*, of the renewed nature.

Mr. Oxenham afterwards takes up (B) what he rightly defines as "another set of texts." They are so, because they refer to what is termed the "positive" aspect of future punishments. They do so under the figure of "the worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched." St. Matt. 18: 8, 9; St. Mark 9: 43, 44. I am of the opinion that Mr. Oxenham's argument from the tropical language here employed in relation to future punishment, would nullify the teachings of the larger portion of Holy Scripture, were it applied in all similar cases. That the fires in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom, or Tophet were kept burning, is, I think, admitted, and although they were of a temporal character, they were used by our Lord to express, not only the positive torments of hell, but also their *continuance*, in accordance with the subjects of such torments; and if Mr. Oxenham allows that the human soul is immortal, then is it also conclusive evidence in favour of such positive punishments as are here referred to, being eternal in their duration.

(7.) What Mr. Oxenham refers to, in St. Matt. 3: 12,

and St. Luke 3: 17. viz., the “chaff” which John the Baptist declares shall be burnt “with unquenched fire,” is at least conclusive evidence, as I consider it was designed to be, of the effectual character, as well as the severity of future punishment. God is declared to be Himself “a consuming fire.” What is the idea we get from hence? Evidently that the judgments of God are inexpressibly severe, and taken in connection with the other passages of Scripture, they certainly afford no hope whatever, of final restoration, to the sinner who leaves this world unpardoned and unrenewed.

Mr. Oxenham, in noticing some passages referred to, in Pearson on the Creed, says that they contain nothing more material than those already considered. We will, however, review them. First, of Rev. 22: 8, “The lake that burneth with fire and brimstone,” is spoken of. If we look upon this description, as connected with what was before spoken of, has it no additional teaching? In order to estimate the *force* of Scripture teaching on any subject, we must take into account that teaching as a whole. There is no doubt that γέεναν τοῦ πυρός in St. Matt. 5: 22, is parallel with Rev. 22: 8, where for “the gehenna of fire” we have τῇ λίμνῃ τῇ καιομένῃ πυρὶ καὶ θείῳ; but with the addition, “which is the second death.” Now here we have the combination of two ideas, the one of utter *destruction*, the other of *suffering and pain*, and used thus, to express the hopeless condition of the wicked in the future world. The same idea is expressed by St. Paul, in 2 Thess. 1: 8, 9, by “everlasting destruction—from the presence of the Lord.” And although

aiώνιος is used here, yet arguing from the fact that the word *άιδιος* is applied to the same subject, and as we have seen there is a connection between the punishment of devils and wicked men which makes it applicable to the latter; and consequently, as *aiώνιος* is used in connection with *πῦρ*, fire, and kindred expressions, as a convertible term with *άιδιος*, therefore, in view of these facts, we are fully justified in here translating it by everlasting in the strictest sense, and in concluding that all the passages considered under this head, (Question 3) when taken collectively, do undoubtedly teach the eternity of future punishment, in the literal sense of that word.

Fourth.—“Is there any decree of the Universal Church, which expressly asserts, or evidently and necessarily presupposes the doctrine in question?”

From the relative value of Church councils and decrees as compared with the word of God, we might, in view of the evidence given by the latter, pass over this question entirely; and it is quite sufficient to remark that while in the early ages of the Church, there was indeed great diversity of opinions upon theoretic doctrines; yet in practical matters, there was little, if any; and this may account for the fact, that a truth so generally received, and it may be added which the moral sense of mankind must ratify, viz., that of future punishment, was so little a matter of controversy, in its details. It would not indeed matter, had the council referred to, declared that Origen’s opinions as to future punishment were correct; and why they were silent upon the subject, a probable conjecture may be given, which is at

least of as much value as that of Mr. Oxenham, viz., that the error itself, carried its own refutation.

Fifth.—“Is there any express consensus, on this exact point, such as to leave no room for doubt as to the mind of the whole Church ?”

It may be objected here, as to some of the former questions, that they require too much, and if it is not legitimate to require evidence from Holy Scripture, such as to represent a demonstration in the strict sense of the word; still less is it reasonable to require such proof from the opinions of men, who as they are at best imperfect; so more especially in the visible Church, (where the evil are ever mingled with the good,) must we look for conflicting opinions. What doctrine of Holy Scripture is not controverted, and by men whom we may not declare to be unchristian ?

Here, I notice, Mr. Oxenham remarks upon the doctrines on which he affirms the eternity of Future Punishment to rest. May we not more correctly say, with which it is connected ? He remarks (page 28 *a*) that the “final judgment,” does not necessarily make that judgment irrevocable, and he supports this idea, by the fact that penalties of earthly courts have an end, although there is a final sentence from the human tribunal.

So, also, of the separation of the wicked from the righteous, by a similar analogy, as the human separation is not final, so may the Divine one not be so, “because God is certainly not less merciful than man.” It needs little consideration to see that this reasoning is entirely fallacious and inadmissible. The fact that

the Judge in this case is both perfect, and because perfect, unchangeable, may be a sufficient answer to both, inasmuch as God being unchangeable, can only be supposed to remit the sentence passed, by reason of a change in the character and conduct of the offenders. But where has He ever given the faintest hope of another time, and other conditions of trial? Mr. Oxenham would appear to cherish some hope (shall we call it?—) of such a provision or purpose, from 1 Cor. 15, which speaks of the general resurrection. Most certainly this is, at best, a speculation, if there are even the faintest grounds for *this*; on the other hand, God has expressly intimated that this world is the place of trial for a future state, and solemnly admonished us so to consider it; but He has never intimated that the results of such trial, can ever after be remedied or changed.

With respect to God's mercy in punishing, as compared with that of man, it is to be remembered that the mercy of God can be no greater than His justice, and even His justice is part of His love. Therefore no inference can be drawn from this, nor can there be any analogy or comparison of His ways with those of man; and it may be philosophically as well as Scripturally argued, that as His nature is unchangeable, so at least will be that judgment which follows such a condition of trial—at least we are not justified in the remotest expectation of such a change, in the absence of any expressed purpose on His part, to do so. Mr. Oxenham asks where Mr. Keble finds the “oath” of God for the eternity of future punishment. I am of

the opinion that it is in what I have referred to, viz., His "Name," who has said, "I am Jehovah. I change not." Mr. Oxenham, by a literal, and as I regard it, a forced interpretation of Is. 28 : 21, tells us that God's wrath is something foreign and "strange" to His nature; but love is the essence of His being. Mercy and truth, are indeed, in our conceptions, opposed to each other; yet are we given to understand, that both exist in God in equal ratio, and each is a part of His perfections. This is expressed in the atonement,—where mercy and truth are shown to us, as "met together."

Mr. Oxenham (page 35-6) objects to Eternal Punishment, and favours, yea, rather we may say teaches Universalism, by a partial interpretation of the following passages, 1 Tim. 1 : 15 ; 2 Tim. 2 : 4 ; 2 Tim. 4 : 10. To the argument here for Universal Salvation, from texts of Scripture, must be opposed other texts which tell of God's electing a certain portion of mankind to salvation by Christ. Eph. 1 : 4-6 ; 1 St. Pet. 1 : 2 ; 2 Thess. 2 : 13 ; and others, which say that Christ's sheep "shall never perish"; St. John 10 : 26-28 : that He "loved the Church and gave Himself for it;" Eph. 5 : 25 ; and that He gave His life a ransom for any: St. Matt. 20 : 20. If the general teaching of Holy Scripture is to be received, and not human opinion, this is conclusive against all such arguments. We know that God's purpose cannot, and will not fail. The question from a Scripture stand-point is this:—What was God's purpose in sending His Son into the world? The answer appears to me to be this: 1. To open a way for salvation to all men. 2. To effectually save those

who believe. 3. To magnify His character in their salvation, and also in the just punishment of those who being offered salvation, reject the same by unbelief and persistent disobedience.

I now notice Mr. Oxenham's remarks on the Parable of Lazarus and Dives. His chief objection is, that the events described are anterior to the day of judgment; but we are distinctly told that at death the righteous go to a place of happiness, and the wicked to a place of misery, and although the cup of each be not full until the day of judgment, yet do we learn that their several conditions are unchangeable. There is no information of ultimate deliverance for the wicked. The whole parable tells fatally against the theory of the Destructionists, inasmuch as it tells of conscious torment, and from it we learn that the wicked even then, are not without what are termed positive, as well as natural punishments; and obviously the parable has additional evidence in favour of the doctrine of Eternal Punishment, and against the theory of final restoration, inasmuch as its general teaching evidently confines all hope of the sinner to earth alone.

The Sixth : "Is there any necessity known to us, or even probability arising from the nature of the case, which would sustain the popular doctrine" ?

Mr. Oxenham, imagining that Scripture countenances the restoration theory, in like manner imagines that Natural Religion does so too. But I think it may be said, that there is at least a strong probability in favour of the eternity of future punishment, from the nature of the case : *i. e.*, that man being a moral agent, and

that an infinitely wise, perfect, and unchangeable God has appointed him here, with so many warnings, a place and time of probation for a future state. I consider that the arguments of Butler in his second chapter, go very far to prove, as far as Natural Religion can do so, that not only is a future state reserved for man, but that the future state of the wicked, like that of the righteous, will be final. The argument from analogy is sustained by Scripture, where the Prophet says, Jer. 8 : 20, "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved." The above quotation, by all law for the interpretation of prophecy, looks to what is commonly called Eternal Salvation : to "the hour of death and the day of judgment." But, in addition to this, I believe that man's moral sense goes to ratify this conclusion. Aggravated, heinous, and persistent sin, begets despair. What doth this teach us ? Is it not that man's moral sense (the work of God) tells him, as does also the law, written and revealed, that for presumptuous sins, and persistent sinners, there is no atonement or forgiveness ! Hope has its dwelling place on earth ; despair has its home in the recesses of hell, the abode of the lost. So this reminds us of another weighty utterance of the Lord of life : " what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul " ? Is there the least hope here held out, of that loss being remedied at a future day ?

Having examined and answered the questions of Mr. Oxenham, as they stand related to the doctrine of Eternal Punishment, I will now remark upon his criticisms of the arguments of the great theologians whom

he has selected as representing that doctrine. Without presuming to stand as apologist for those great divines in this connection, I may yet remark that I am of opinion that the doctrine under discussion is not to be measured by philosophical argument, nor can such be safely used, save in subordination to, and in corroboration of, the express testimony of the word and will of God.

If St. Augustine, and Thomas Aquinas, have dealt largely with philosophical argument upon this subject, Mr. Oxenham has also attempted the philosophical and speculative argument; and he will pardon me if he should ever see or hear of what is here written, if I say, that I think that all his argument is rather from the stand-point of reason than that of Divine Revelation. He speaks (p. 55,) of the punishment of the wicked to eternity, as being speculatively possible, and says of it; "I disbelieve it." The grounds of his "disbelief," he gives, as being that he considers it contrary to God's purpose and nature. Nevertheless, God has revealed himself as inflexibly just, as well as inflexibly good.

Mr. Oxenham believes in eternal happiness, because he considers this agreeable to God's nature. In the light of Revelation, why may it be argued that God is more good than just? Because Mr. Oxenham does consider that the nature, and practice of sin (although against God, and a God of great patience and long-suffering as well as goodness, who has given a Saviour in his Incarnate Son—given the Holy Spirit, and a period of probation), *sin*, does not, in justice, require such a punishment. (See p. 39.) What kind of

argument can this be called ? Nay ! we may not ask of what kind, but of what quality ? This at least we may say, not only is it speculative, but it is rather the argument of a mere moralist, than of a Christian believer ! If otherwise, it must involve most unscriptural views of original sin, and a very inadequate estimate of the value of the atonement.

There is but one more matter that I shall notice, and this is because it has a bearing upon the argument from Scripture, under the head of question 2, as proposed by Mr. Oxenham. At page 66 he quotes the example of Satan and the evil angels, as given by Dr. Pusey, as "a speculative argument by way of analogy." He says, that there can be no analogy between Satan's sin, and that of incorrigibly wicked men, on account of Satan's superior advantages, and he depreciates our advantages in such a manner, as to conclude that we may not justly be placed in the same category as subjects for God's judgment. But here I have to remark, that we are not left to speculative argument upon this matter, inasmuch as we have evidence from Holy Scripture. So far as we may trace any analogy, it lies in this :—whatever Satan's advantages were, he and those with whom he was associated, had a test appointed by God, and a time of trial, as we learn from St. Jude, and 2 St. Peter 2:4. The devil and his angels fell from their allegiance, and for them no Saviour was provided, by reason of their previous advantages ; at least, we are led so to infer.

Adam when tried, fell, and so all his posterity. In the wisdom of God, for him and for them, a Saviour was

provided, and a further period and terms of grace. Such as refuse those terms, and are finally disobedient in this world, will share Satan's doom. The doom of Satan and wicked men, is the same—described in the same terms; by the word *ἀδιός* as applied to Satan and the evil angels, and by the word *αἰώνιος*, with *πῦρ*, and *κόλασις*, when both are spoken of; while it is said that this *πῦρ*, and *κόλασις*, is “prepared for the devil and his angels.” As partakers of a like character, they will be punished together, in the same place, and by the same punishments; and as the two expressions appear to be used as convertible terms, it amounts to a demonstration, that their doom is the same—endless and eternal.

That this should provoke the objections of philosophic sceptics, we might not wonder, or that it should evoke the opposition of wicked men: we may well wonder that any sincere believers in the Holy Scriptures, may find in it any just cause of stumbling, either to themselves or others. That it is indeed a profoundly solemn, yea, *awful* subject, we should and must feel; but in accordance with all the scope and tenor of Holy Writ, it can but call forth such utterances now, as it did from believers of old. “Thou even Thou, art to be feared, and who may stand in Thy sight when once Thou art angry”? Psalm 76: 7. “Thy righteousness is like the great mountains; Thy judgments are a great deep.” Psalm 36: 6.

PART 2.

MODERN UNIVERSALISM IN ITS POSITIVE ASPECT.

—
CHAP. I.*Analytical Synopsis.*

The objections of Mr. Oxenham to the received doctrine concerning Future Punishment, appear to have been preparatory to, what is now explicitly advocated by others, that is to say, the doctrine of universal salvation.

Two writers of the present day are decided teachers of this doctrine: These are Mr. Jukes and Mr. Cox. The one is the author of "Salvator Mundi": the other of the "Restitution of all Things." They take somewhat different methods in arguing for their theory, so it will be necessary to take both works, more or less, into consideration, in endeavouring to present the Scripture argument, against the system which they represent. It will, I think, be conceded by all, that the character of Holy Scripture, is a question which underlies the matter for our consideration. According to the views held, concerning its nature, as a revelation from the Deity, so will our exegesis of its teaching, be governed. What is applicable to the whole of its teaching, is perhaps especially applicable to this

most solemn, yea, *awful* subject, of Future Punishment. Mr. Jukes introduces his teaching by a statement of his views concerning "the nature of Holy Scripture." That he does so, is evidence, not only that he accepts the principle which I have stated ; but also, that this argument is a candid and honest one, although I believe it to be based upon an incorrect view of the inspiration of Holy Scripture.

Herein, his position is quite different from that of many writers upon the subject of Future Punishment.

All who reject the orthodox view, fail here ; but not in the same way. The position taken by "A Layman," in criticising Canon Farrar's work, is the boldest one that I have met with, in this connection. He says, "Let us clearly understand that we have to deal with this question, in terms of the moral system," (to use Mr. Mansel's phrase,) "and having said that, let us stick to it." This, as I understand it, leaves the question to philosophic morality, and excludes revelation, and so, the God of Revelation, as a witness in the case. The "Layman" is evidently a Universalist, and as he is also evidently a representative man, amongst the academic laity, I will quote another passage. "You will find, among educated and thoughtful persons, a few here and there, who cannot at once see, or will not admit, that the idea of an infallible Book is as absurd as that of an infallible Pope." With this writer the author of the Bible is no more infallible than the Pope ; for remember, it is the Bible—God's Book, that he is speaking of, and not this or that *interpretation* of it. We see, therefore, what a principle we have to

deal with ; and the inference is very clear and ready as to whence that principle proceeds.

Now, to consider Mr. Jukes's theory as to the nature of Holy Scripture. I must first, however, notice that he gives as a *reason* for the view afterwards set forth concerning its nature, and inspiration, that he found it to solve certain "difficulties," and "apparent contradictions" in Scripture, concerning the "restitution of all things," and other statements concerning Future Punishment. The grounds of such "apparent contradictions," we will consider hereafter. Mr. Jukes endeavours to trace an analogy between what he terms "the three Revelations of God ;" that is to say, Nature, Holy Scripture, and the Incarnate Word. He says, that it is true of all of these, they are "as much a veil, as a revelation of the Deity." (pp. 6-17). I shall not proceed at any length to combat this statement, as it refers to God's works in Nature, nor to the Person of our Lord and Saviour ; I will but say that it equally applies to all three of these "Revelations of God," that the knowledge which we obtain of Him thereby, is an *imperfect* knowledge ; equally so, as to the *fact*, though not so, as to the *degree* ; but it cannot be said of any one of them, that it bears doubtful, or contradictory testimony to its author. It is true of our incarnate Saviour, that He presented the Deity to us, under the veil of humanity ; still the Scriptures tell us, as a *fact*, that "God was manifest in the flesh ;" that "men beheld the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ :" (2 Cor. 4 : 16,) so also, that "He (Jesus) has declared Him," or made Him

manifest. (John 1 : 18.) Equally clear is the witness borne by other portions of Holy Scripture to the fact that God's works in nature give a similar testimony to, and manifestation of His character. So, Ps. 19 : 4, as quoted by St. Paul, in Rom. 10 : 18, "But, I say, have they not heard ? Yes verily, their sound went forth into all lands, and their words unto the ends of the world." So also, that "the invisible things of Him, are *clearly seen*, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse." (Rom. 1 : 20.) The character of our Lord Jesus was no clouded nor dubious revelation of God's character. His character, we may say, was fully exhibited, as far as man could profitably behold it, and also clearly and unmistakably, both by His miracles, and by His human holiness. It is equally true that all God's works praise Him : *i. e.* as God. (Ps. 145 : 10).

This truth is quite unaffected by the fact of "the sun appearing to go down," as noticed by Mr. Jukes ; because the revelations referred to, in their analogy to Scripture, and to the Scripture doctrine of Future Punishment, are such as concern God's character, as a moral governor, and not matters of mere detail, or *modus operandi*.

The views taken by Mr. Jukes, concerning Holy Scripture, directly contravene the statements of Scripture concerning its own character. He says, that it contains both a Divine and a human element, even as our Saviour Christ had both a Divine and a human nature. St. Paul, we find, commends the Thessalonians,

(1 Thess. ii. 13) in that “ when they received the Word of God, which they heard of him, they received it not as the word of *men*, but, as it is in truth, the Word of God.”

This statement, while acknowledging human *instrumentality*, excludes, as do many other similar utterances, the principle of a human element entering into its *composition*. It is simply and purely the Word of God ; not of God and man. God’s Word by Peter, or Paul, or John, yet God’s Word only. As such, therefore, Truth : simply, purely, perfectly, not *containing* truth.

This does not necessarily entail what is called the “ mechanical ” theory of inspiration ; on the contrary, as opposed both to that theory and to the view of Mr. Jukes, I believe that not only the mental faculties of the writers were utilized, but also, that all the surroundings of such mental faculties, as stereotyped in the individual man, even the idiosyncrasies of his mental training, and mode of thought, and associations of life, are visible in all those writings by him, the *substance* and *elements* of which are *all*, nevertheless, purely and fully, the work of the Holy Ghost.

Any lower view of inspiration than this, does in effect deprive us of all that comfort and confidence which we look for in an inspired and authoritative Revelation from the Diety. Herein, as the generally received and proper view (as I conceive) of revelation, is based upon a different view of the nature of inspiration than that which underlies Mr. Jukes’s book, it must obviously lead to very different conclusions, as also to

a very different principle of exegesis ; but as I intend to say a little upon the latter subject, afterwards, I shall not enter upon it here.

I shall now but compare the different processes adopted by Mr. Jukes and Mr. Cox, in presenting and arguing for Universalism. Both start with a "difficulty."

Mr. Jukes has a certain view of some passages of Scripture, some of them obscure in their meaning.

He believes that the language of a certain class of passages, that he considers to be represented by Acts 3 : 21, which speaks of "the restitution of all things, of which God had spoken by the mouth of all His holy Prophets since the world began ;" refers to a design of ultimate salvation of the whole human race ; but this view is opposed by another class of passages, much more plain and obvious in their meaning, which point to quite a different result. That result, however, is one so repugnant to Mr. Jukes's view of moral fitness, that he seeks refuge from it, in the view of Holy Scripture previously noticed, by which the *literal* sense is excluded, as the human element in Revelation. Mr. Cox starts with our Lord's words to Chorazin and Bethsaida : "Woe unto thee, Chorazin ! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida ! for if the mighty works which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, or in Sodom, they would have repented long ago, and continued unto this day": Matt. 11 : 20, 24. Why, then, says Mr. Cox, were they not done, in order to bring about such a result, which God would have, seeing He desires all men to be saved ? In the first place, he says that

Christ's miracles could not have been done in *every* age ; so, although he chose that age to appear in, and to do miracles before those who would not be profited by them, for good and sufficient reasons ; yet, such is God's necessary character, that as He wills (?) so He can, if He will, save all men ; therefore, there *must* be another period of trial given to men, besides that in this world, when God will so work upon all men (yea and the devils, too, says Mr. Jukes,) that they will all repent, and all at last be saved. But how to bring Scripture to say so ? Mr. Jukes's method is allegorizing interpretation. Mr. Cox's is, first, to choose *certain parts* of Scripture, excluding the rest for the time ; secondly, to take certain *words* in their abstract and etymological signification ; sever them from their context ; then to reject a particular meaning, legitimate in *certain connections* ; say they *never* have that meaning ; then to take an *ex parte* view of the whole *scope* of revelation ; and the result is, the desired end, which is, that Scripture teaches universal salvation.

I will here add a few words, as to Canon Farrar's views on inspiration.

I am unable to conclude otherwise than that he concurs in all that "A Layman" has advanced, as he says, in his "Answer to his Critics :" "The three remaining papers powerfully support what I desired to maintain."

Again, the remarks of the "Layman" deserve the very earnest consideration of all who desire, above all things, to be faithful, honest, and true.

It is, no doubt, a commendable feature of the "Layman's" criticism that it is outspoken ; but does Canon

Farrar endorse his teaching as to the inspiration of the Scriptures, and the "terms of the moral system?" I am obliged to conclude that he does.

In his "Life of Christ," pages 156, 157, and 158, ch. 23, Canon Farrar gives further evidence of radical unsoundness upon this all-important subject.

I shall next consider Mr. Cox's order of investigation of the testimony of Holy Scripture.

CHAP. II.

Process of Investigation.

I now consider Mr. Cox's method and order of enquiry into the teaching of Holy Scripture.

It would, indeed, appear as if he would rather have declined such a course, (*i.e.* an appeal to Holy Scripture.) He enters a preliminary "protest against the assumption that Reason and Conscience are to have no voice in the determination."

"Still, as the appeal is to the Bible, (he) will go to the Bible, reserving, however, the right to interpret it by (his) reason and conscience." p. 25.

In entering the field of Holy Scripture, he makes another provision; namely, that "not every Book of the Bible speaks, on all themes, with equal distinctness and authority." That the utterances of our Lord and His Apostles have a prior claim to our regard, as of

more weight. Also, he objects to severing expressions from their context (p. 25). This is noteworthy, and will be hereafter considered. For the reason given above, he prefers to go to "the very cream of Scripture," "the plain teaching of our Lord and His Apostles." But let us understand that here, while he excludes the Revelation of St. John, he also excludes the Parables of our Lord, because of these, he says, "we have not the key!" He professes, indeed, great fairness and honesty of intention in this process; but while I do not intend to pronounce upon his motives, I do most decidedly pronounce an objection to the *fact* of such an order and rule of investigation. If it is written concerning even so obscure a Book as the Revelation of St. John, "Blessed is he that readeth the words of the prophecy of this Book," which has a distinct connection with the Eschatology of the race, as well as with the History of the Church; if it is said also, that "those things which are *revealed* belong to us and to our children for ever," for a similar purpose of instruction and profit; it is at least *equally* true of the other parts of the Inspired Record, excluded by the judgment of Mr. Cox.

Moreover, there is a principle of "fairness" and sound reason in taking a very opposite course to that proposed by him: that is, it is manifestly the only fair and reasonable method of enquiry to follow the chronological order, and begin to consider Scripture testimony upon this subject, where Scripture itself begins, at the Genesis of man's history as a fallen being, subject to death and judgment. But there is another

factor in the calculation not to be forgotten. That factor is, Natural Religion. It runs in parallel line with man's history as a fallen being. It tells man, as does Revelation, "the soul that sinneth it shall die," and it has ever borne this testimony since man became a sinner. Orthodox Theologians, and all who love and supremely believe in the Bible as a supernatural Revelation from God, may be grateful for the fact, upon which Canon Farrar congratulates Prof. Jellett, that he has "with a calmness and courtesy worthy of all praise, defended the great canon of Bishop Butler on the relation of Natural to Revealed Religion;" and also that Principal Tulloch "urges against Universalism the law of continuity." (Canon Farrar's Answer to his Critics, pp. 61-62.) I hope to show that Natural Religion, justly interpreted, is no more favourable to Universalism in all its aspects, than it is to Materialism. Suffice it here to say, that I prefer to commence the study of Holy Scripture in its relation to Universalism, just where I commence such study in relation to Materialism—at the Book of Genesis.

In this case, I do so, fortified by a special argument against Mr. Cox's method of procedure, that as there *was no man, nor time*, at which, and to whom, natural religion did *not* bear its testimony in relation to sin and judgment; so neither was there any period since the Fall, in which Holy Scripture did not do so too.

With regard to *degrees* of knowledge concerning this and every doctrinal and practical truth, it is important to bear in mind, that the Bible presents a *progressive* Revelation; but, at the same time, that of those neces-

sary *elements* of religion, essentially connected with the person and character of Deity, and man's duty in regard to Him, man was never left wholly without light ; hence, if Future Punishment is true *now*, it was true *then*, as God's character and man's relation to Him, as a sinner, are the same now as then. While God from the beginning threatened a punishment to sin ; when He pronounced and carried out sentence against man, He gave Hope of a future deliverance by "the seed of the woman." The efficacy of such deliverance, as it applied to the *individual* man, was obviously limited to such of the race as *hoped* and *trusted* in it. The upright and sincere endeavour to "seek after the Lord,"—the favour of whom they had forfeited by sin, "if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him," should be so accepted, and also their sincere efforts to obey that knowledge, was so provided for. From the beginning then, we can trace a provision for the acceptance of the sincerely obedient, while the disobedient came under the penalty of a broken law ; a penalty pronounced by "the voice within the heart," and ratified by an oral and written Law. We have from the beginning, evidence of God's Law, His revealed Law of procedure with His creatures ; and that such Law points to the trial of all, and the *acceptance* of some. It is evident, whatever may be the *character*, or *duration* of the punishment inflicted upon the disobedient, that some, yea ! a large portion of the human family, have lived and died without a full knowledge of it, in these aspects, although not without a knowledge of the *fact*. That fact was, in the Divine Wisdom,

regarded as sufficient: also the similarly imperfect knowledge of a provision for Redemption. Here then is provision,—so far as man could then know,—for a dualism of character and condition. This, as a certain fact, was made patent to man's moral sense, by two witnesses, by Natural and by Revealed Religion. Here, too, is unmistakable proof, that this first principle of practical religion was from the first inculcated. We have proof also, not only that such a truth was taught, but also that it was in like manner illustrated.

This dualism of character and of destiny, was exemplified in the first *brothers*, and in the first family. One was "of God"; the other, "of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous."

Shortly after this period in the history of the race, we read of men beginning to call upon "the name of the Lord." By this we understand to be declared, the fact that assemblies of professed worshippers of Jehovah were formed, and so distinguished from the children of wickedness.

Then of the translation of Enoch, who walked with God, and quickly following, of that all but universal and monstrous wickedness in the Earth, which called down at last, a signal judgment from the Almighty.

The Tower of Babel, Noah's Flood, the call of Abraham, the history and destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, all bear evidence to a continuous line of witnesses for evil and for good, and of the Almighty's dealings with such according to their works. So of the Exodus, and of Pharaoh and the Egyptians. The

children of God on one side, and of Satan on the other, and of God's progressive and continuous trial and separation by moral law and moral sanctions, between the righteous and the wicked.

The history of Job is testimony in the same age of a similar character of procedure.

The same constancy of the Divine character, and of a sharp drawn line of demarcation, constituted by Him between the character and destiny of the righteous and the wicked is uniformly evident all through the Sacred Writings. Solomon says: (Prov. 24: 24,) "He that saith to the wicked, thou art righteous, him shall the people curse, nations shall abhor him; but to them that rebuke him shall be delight, and a good blessing shall be upon them."

This evidence is very important, as we shall see hereafter, although Universalists are ready to acknowledge that there is a *present* difference between the characters and prospects of men. With them this difference is not so essential, so radical, so permanent and far reaching, as we have long learned to consider it to be. Let us have it well established in our minds, that it is a deep settled purpose of the Almighty, that there shall *ever* be a broad line of demarcation between the righteous and the wicked. "Say ye to the righteous, that it shall be well with him, for they shall eat of the fruit of their doings. Woe to the wicked! it shall be ill with him, for the reward of his hands shall be given him." (Is. 3: 10, 11.) This testimony could easily be amplified, but it is quite unnecessary.

The whole Book of Job bears testimony, even at

that early day, that no principle was better known than this, “that the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction; they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath.” (Job 21:30.) Also, that “destruction shall be to the wicked, and a strange punishment to the workers of iniquity.” Job 31:3.

The Hebrew is expressive of something different from annihilation, **נָוֹד** in its Etymology, being derived from **נָזַד** to bend, or to burden. So also **נָכַר** a strange marvellous, or remarkable thing, from **נָכַר** To look upon intently,—1. To admire. 2. To wonder.

This fact as it stands associated (1) with the character of sin, (2) with persistent sinners, and (3) with Satanic alliance and co-operation, is anything but a hopeful outlook from a Scripture standpoint for the the advocates of Final Restoration, or for those who cherish Canon Farrar’s principle of a *Hope* in that direction. It is, I fear, but a false hope, in all its *essential* features.

Specially is it to be noted that our Lord and Saviour, in very plain words, states this wide distinction between the destiny of the righteous and of the wicked. He explicitly confines the blessings of His salvation to “His Sheep,” to “those who receive Him,” to those who hear His words.” For such He gave His life. Such His Father “had given to Him.” Of them He would “lose none,” but they should be “raised up at the last day,”—that is, to *glory*. Of all others He says, they shall “die in their sins.” They shall be raised to “the resurrection of condemnation.” To such He will say, “Depart ye cursed.”

Without giving passages in detail, it is quite sufficient to remark, that the words "death" and "life," as applied to the righteous and to the wicked, and also such expressions as "destruction," "consumption," "rooted out," "perish," &c., &c., which are applied by Materialists, in support of *annihilation* of the wicked, afford very clear and decided evidence against any hope being held out by Holy Scripture of the restoration of such to God's favour, upon whom sentence has been passed at the last day, or to those who "die in their sins."

Surely words could not be "plainer" than these! It would take a very plain and full revelation to make out that all this intends only a fatherly, and purgative, and reformatory discipline. But, as further reason against such a fancy, be it remembered that our Lord said to some, "Ye are of your father the Devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." Of one of His own disciples it is specially and emphatically said by our Lord, he "is a devil." What do we understand by this? One desperately and finally matured in chosen and malignant sin. So, too, let it be remembered, that the Gospel of God's grace, when *known* and *sinned against*, matures the most desperate sinners.

Let me notice, in the last place, that as Revelation proceeds, it gives cumulative force to two great and cardinal ideas. These are, Judgment and Salvation. The judgments threatened to individuals in relation to time, or predicated of them as connected with certain courses of conduct, are all utilized, and strongly expressed, to point to *spiritual* and *future* judgment. Thus the *force* acquired from such expressions with

regard to their *remediless* character, are misapplied by Materialists.

So the salvation of the righteous in *this* world by the Lord, as in Psalm 1, "Salvation belongeth to the Lord : Thy blessing is upon thy people," points to a greater salvation, yet to be manifested.

Further, as local national judgments are prophesied of, they are so associated with a great and universal judgment of *all* the nations ; and again *this* great crisis in the world's history is but representative of, and preparative for, something far more tremendous and decisive. Such are we to understand of the last great onslaught of Anti-Christian power, *after* the millennial reign of Christ and His saints.

All this, (in illustration of "the law of continuity," in *all* its relations,) does not give much encouragement to those who look for Final Restoration. So, the judgment of "Babylon the great," is bound up with the forces of Satan and wicked men. Here we have the co-extensive consolidation of opposite forces of righteousness and of wickedness ; for, as each is becoming the choice and confirmed practice of the moral agents allied therewith, so is the future of each, by a law of God, stamped on all His works, physical and moral, being determined and fixed accordingly. So I read Holy Scripture, and so I understand the teaching of Natural Religion.

Mr. Jukes, by an allegorical interpretation of Scripture, fancies that he sees a different purpose in the Divine government. I shall therefore next endeavour to consider the Laws of Scripture Exegesis.

CHAP. III.

Laws of Scripture Exegesis.

As preliminary to the consideration of this important topic, it will be necessary to refer again to the position assumed by Mr. Jukes, in regard to the Nature of Holy Scripture. We have seen that he says of it, as of the other revelations of God referred to, it is a *veil* as much as a *revelation*. We now have to notice the fact, that he makes this assertion to apply to *every part* of Holy Scripture, and for all practical purposes it would appear, in an *equal degree*. It is true that he recognizes (p. 14), "law and gospel, flesh and spirit," yet he says (p. 13), that "*throughout* it is a veil, while it is a *revelation*." So, it is evident (1) that this affirmation is *intended*, by what he says, (p. 11) to include the Historical Books of Scripture; and (2) that as he says of *all* the revelations, they are *alike* "veils," so also he says of Holy Scripture that *it* is so, "*throughout*," therefore, that in its *several parts*, it is *equally* so, "a *veil* as well as a *revelation*." Whether the principle which he asserts, is intended to apply in *degree*, as well as in *kind* to the whole of Holy Scripture, or not, the principle must invalidate the *trustworthiness* and *veracity* of the Historical Books of Scripture, because *it* decidedly militates against, and *denies* the literal sense, as it declares *it*, to be the human element: the "*veil*," not the "*revelation*." So that, if indeed any History is allowed to be given to us thereby, it is not *actually*

(because not discernibly and literally, to the plain understanding and common sense of *mankind at large*,) an *intelligible*, and therefore not a *true* History.

It would also be a valid objection to such a view of Holy Scripture, that it is not regarded as a *progressive* revelation of the Deity. Such would appear to be intended by Mr. Jukes. But, if he does not intend to assert, that the *degree*, as well as the *principle* of a “veil” in revelation, equally holds throughout; such a view of matters would appear to be required, in order to the *homogeneity* of the theory which he propounds, in regard to *all* the revelations; that an *equal*, as well as a *similar* principle of obscurity, pervades the whole; and that Holy Scripture, as a part of the revelations that God has given, shares throughout, in *all its parts*, in an equal degree, in this common principle of them all, of being “a veil as well as a revelation.”

Such a view is decidedly adverse to a *known* and Divinely asserted principle of God’s governance; but not only so, it distinctly depreciates the very highest revelation of God’s character, which He has seen fit to give to us, and has explicitly so declared; for our Lord Jesus says: “If *I* had not come and spoken to them they had not had sin, but *now* they have no cloak for their sin.” However, we need not to press either argument against Mr. Jukes. It is quite sufficient for our purpose, that his theory, in order to its logical force as an exegetical principle, must *destroy* (I do not say *now*, a cardinal principle of inspiration—its veracity), but the distinction between, (I mention no more,) the historical and other portions of the Word of God.

Either there *is*, or there is *not*, such a distinction. If there is *no* such distinction, one principle of exegesis will apply to them all. If, on the other hand, there *is* such a *discernible* and *stated* difference, then the same principle of exegesis will *not* apply to them all.

Now, that such a difference between the several books of the Holy Scripture is discernible, the plain and uninstructed reason of an unlettered person, (I will not say of any *literateur*, or historian) may, and will acknowlege, and declare. Let us, too, remember that the Bible is addressed to a mixed class of readers, and not *exclusively*, either to the *learned*, or to the *religious*. But we are not left room to doubt, or, so far as Bible testimony is received, to differ upon this point.

The Bible tells us of this difference. St. Luke, in the preface to his Gospel, speaks of such narratives or histories, of the life and death of Jesus of Nazareth, being prepared and arranged by others; and so, on account of a *similar* knowledge of the *historical facts* thereof himself, he proceeds to do the same, for the purpose of ratification of the historical verity of the Gospel. The Greek word *διήγησις*—narrative, or history, is entirely unequivocal in its signification. It is not necessary to elaborate proof, that what is true of the Gospels, viz., that they contain, and are presented as conveying, a literal and true *history* of the life, and death of our Saviour, is equally true of the Acts of the Apostles, and that the Books of Moses, have, *as a whole*, this distinct character of Historical Books.

So likewise, that the Book of Psalms, as a whole is *devotional*, and the Book of Proverbs, of a *moral* or

practical character. All that is necessary for us to notice is this, that Mr. Jukes's theory as to the "nature of Scripture," would destroy all and every distinction, by making every part of Holy Scripture, as much a veil, as a revelation of the Deity.

Of course we recognize, when referring to the historical character of the Gospels, that while such is the great fact concerning them, and the feature that characterizes them, *viz.*, that they are histories, and therefore correct records of *facts*, concerning our Lord's *life*; that they *also contain* a true statement of His *miracles*, and of His *teaching*; and *therefore* that such parts of them require a different method of exegesis. More than this, our Lord's teaching was both dogmatical and parabolical; therefore, such teaching requires a further sub-division, as to the method and rule of its exegesis.

To the one belongs a literal, to the other, a figurative method of interpretation. It is just at this point, that the great error characterizing Mr. Jukes's theory, declares itself. His method of allegorical interpretation, as applied to the whole of Scripture, is *his* way of meeting the difficult problem of God's method of moral government. We may not say that it is made for the occasion, for no doubt Mr. Jukes fully believes in it as correct. So have many mystics been equally sincere, but no less in error.

It may be noticed here, that while the *allegorical* sense is the dependence of those, who, like Mr. Jukes, while being Universalists, give some honest tribute to Holy Scripture; the *literal sense* is the only way that

the Materialist, who does not altogether deny the Word of God, can find even a semblance of support for *his* theory, which at best, is both illogical and unscriptural.

Therefore, upon the basis of this radical distinction in the objects and methods of their teaching, mainly the distinction between facts and *truths* properly so called, to which Holy Scripture testifies, we have to reject Mr. Jukes's arbitrary and partial system of Scripture exegesis. There is *one* nature and character that marks the Word of God as a whole: it is fully and perfectly a Divine communication, although through a human instrumentality; and although such instrumentality preserves therein, all that belongs, naturally, to the capacities and surroundings of the individual moral agent; it is free from all imperfection, while it shews the human medium by which it is conveyed. It is the Word of God, and not *containing* the Word of God; it is Divine, not Divine and Human; it is the Revelation of God, entirely sufficient to meet the need which God has ordained it to supply; and not at the same, time *both* a veil and a revelation. Therefore, while one great feature and characteristic belongs to it as such, as being a Book of God; it requires in its several parts, different rules of exegesis, in accordance with the ends and objects, the time and circumstances, belonging thereto. It is upon this basis, that certain Canons for the interpretation of different parts of Scripture, have been framed, and have long been accepted, by learned, and laborious students of Holy Scripture.

It is not necessary to notice these in detail; it is

quite sufficient that we have shown good and sufficient grounds, for the principle here asserted, as opposed to the partial and arbitrary method laid down by Mr. Jukes. Such Canons are based upon the accepted and ascertained fact, that while all of the Bible is fully inspired, some portions are historical, some prophetic, some poetical, some moral and dogmatical, some parabolical. The two great features of Scripture interpretation, are the literal, and the figurative sense. Both are true, and applicable according to the beforementioned sub-divisions and classifications. A just principle of Scripture exegesis, embraces *both*. Universalism identifies itself with one ; Materialism with the other. I have said that it is but necessary to shew, a radical difference in the aim and object, or of the circumstances surrounding, certain portions of the Word of God, in order to deny the validity of Mr. Jukes's plea for his method of interpreting Holy Scripture; I cannot, however, close this branch of the subject, without noticing the fact, that the absolute rule of allegorical interpretation, does also militate against the important principle, of a gradual development of God's purposes, and of progressive clearness in the whole of His written revelation. He says, (p. 32,) "While it is true that the letter of that law (of Moses) cannot be explained but by the Gospel, it is no less true that the Gospel, in its breadth and depth, cannot be set forth save by the figures of the law, each jot of which covers some blessed mystery." *This* does not give much advantage to the Gospel as a *clearer* revelation. The "veil and the revelation," appear to be about *equal* in both cases.

Certainly it does not justify St. Paul's depreciation of the ceremonial law as "weak and beggarly elements." (Gal. 4: 9.) Nor his statement that the types of the law constituted a tutelage for mankind, when, at an earlier period of their history, they were in God's wisdom, treated as "children under tutors and governors : (ch. 4 : 1-3.) Nor does it give much emphasis to what he says, 2 Cor. : 3—that it (the law) "had no glory in this respect, because of the glory that excelleth," and that the Gospel has a *superior*, because an enduring glory, while the glory of the law is *done away*. Mr. Jukes however, tells us that we cannot *appreciate* the Gospel without the aid of the law, as it unfolds its glory to us. Indeed all that ingenious and elaborate theory which he evolves from Revelation by this process, does but amplify the statement.

It cannot be said, however, that it justifies it. By his method of interpretation, the order is actually inverted, and the ceremonial law assumes *greater glory* than the Gospel, as it gives us (what we could scarcely dream of without it,) a clear revelation,—that is, supposing the theory to be true,—of a perfect scheme of salvation for the whole human race, as a purpose of God eternally conceived, and to be carried out, through or by means of, successive "ages!"

Here, however, we will pause, and in the next chapter take up, and consider in order, the theory he propounds, concerning, 1. The first-born and first-fruits. 2. Concerning *salvation* by the first-born. 3. Salvation by death, "in the ages"; or, the doctrine of the aeons, and of the second death.

CHAP. IV.

First-born and First-fruits—Mr. Jukes's Theory.

Next in order, I shall proceed to consider the theory which Mr. Jukes has elaborated, concerning the First-born and First-fruits ; this will take precedence, because Mr. Jukes has made it the substance of his argument for universal salvation.

Mr. Cox's argument as to election, is kindred to it, yet from a different stand-point.

I shall first state Mr. Jukes's argument, and then proceed to discuss it ; and after having reviewed Mr. Cox's theory upon the same subject, I shall deal with the matter in a positive form.

We have seen his idea of the human element in revelation, as distinguished from the Divine element ; and that the literal sense is to be discarded, because it is the human element in revelation. The connection between his premiss and conclusion is evident, when we consider his theory of the first-born. In order to maintain such connection, he says that it is the first-born, not of the man, but of the woman ; because “ just as He, the Incarnate Word, was born of a woman, out of the order of nature, without the operation of man, by the power of God's Spirit ; so exactly has the Written Word come out of the human heart, not by the operation of the human understanding, that is, the man in us, but by the power of the Spirit of God directly acting upon the heart.” (pp. 5, 6.) Here, let us notice,

is another kind of a *semi-mechanical* theory of Inspiration : "not by the human *understanding*, but directly upon the *heart*!!"

Consequently, the first-born needs to be the *woman's* first-born.

But here let us also see, that while Mr. Jukes's idea of the nature of Holy Scripture requires him to allegorize the *whole* of it; as the literal sense is the *human* element, and therefore untrue; he does here actually use this term of first-born in a *literal* sense, and he does so most inconsistently with his own theory, and also most incorrectly. A rigid literalism, or a rigid allegorizing, cannot be, it would appear, even consistently carried out; much less can either be so applied *correctly*.

The first-born of the woman, then, is required by this hypothesis to be the *literal first-born*; but if the law of the first-born is to be traced so far back, even from the Fall; if we are to go back from anti-type to type, the law and practice of the patriarchal age must form a part of the law of the first-born. Such in fact would appear to be the Divine Law concerning the first-born, from the Words of Jehovah to Cain, "And to thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him." (Gen. 4: 7.)

Consistently with this, Jacob says of Reuben : "Reuben, thou art *my* first-born, my might, and the beginning of my strength, the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power."

So, also, (Deut. 21: 16) the *father's* first-born is evidently regarded, in the law protecting the first-born of the hated wife.

Here, then, is a flaw in the argument from the beginning: (a) In that the term "first-born" is used literally against Mr. Jukes's own and chosen principle of allegorical interpretation, to which his view of the nature of Holy Scripture commits him throughout; and (b) that his theory concerning the woman's first-born, is denied by the *facts* of the Inspired Word; and also that such facts, as before referred to, are further ratified by the provisions of the law concerning the first-born of the hated wife. That Christ is the first-born, primarily to be understood here, is the opinion of Mr. Jukes.

Christ, however, we are to understand, *literally*, not metaphorically; so He is such in a double sense. 1. He is so in His *life*. "He is the first-born of every creature." "First-born from above, *first out of life*, for He is the Only-Begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father, before all worlds." ("Rest of all things." p. 31.) Here Mr. Jukes quotes Col. 1: 15, 17, and 18; and it would appear that he means a literal first-born, for he says, "first out of life." I do not wish to press his words further in his application of this passage, *i. e.*, "first-born of every creature." But, he says that Christ is (2) the first-born in His death, for He is "the first-born from the dead;" "first out of death." (p. 31). Here, too, we can no otherwise consider, but that he uses the literal sense. Christ is literally in both applications of the term, the first-born.

But further,—if Christ is first-born, so are also His people. They are the "first-born" as distinguished from the "later-born"; so here, too, the literal sense

holds: partly, in that they are first in order of time, *spiritually* begotten by His Spirit; the other class, *later* so begotten, and begotten by Christ, through the instrumentality of His people.

But as Christ was "first-born," in His being "first out of life," and also "first out of death," so His people are also; and as they bear part with Christ in his work during *life*, so also in *death*. As Christ was a Prophet in His life, so are they; as He was after death to the spirits in Hades, so are *they*; and through their agency, the *later* born are begotten in Hades, as also their brethren of the *first-born*, are upon earth.

Mr. Jukes says, they like Christ, are both Prophets, Priests, and Kings, "as first-born with Christ, to share the glory of Kingship and Priesthood with Him, not only to rule, and intercede for their younger and later born brethren, but to avenge their blood, to raise up seed to the dead, and, in and through Christ their life and head, to redeem their lost inheritance."—p. 34.

In a very singular way, Mr. Jukes endeavours to prove this by the law of the first-born of beasts. The first-born of all cattle, was sacred to Jehovah. So also the first-born of man, in memory of the Exodus. The first-born of the children were to be redeemed by an animal. So also the first-born of an *ass*, was to be redeemed by a *lamb*.

The clean redeemed the *unclean*. So Mr. Jukes wishes to prove that the righteous redeem the wicked! But the law affected many, or at least *several* kinds of clean animals, and but *one* kind of the unclean, so that, by the analogy of Mr. Jukes, only a *part* of the

unclean, sinners or rebellious, would be provided for, *not all*.

What is said by Mr. Jukes of the “first-born,” is in a similar way said of the “first fruits,” and in the sheaf of first fruits, and the unleavened cakes of the Pass-over, Mr. Jukes traces a type, severally of Christ, and His people. “Christ the first fruits,” (1 Cor. 15: 23) and we “a kind of first-fruits of His creatures.” (James 1: 18). Here also, he adheres to the *literal* sense of the word. His theory of Universal Redemption he conceives to have been favoured by a provision in the calendar of the Church, previous to the Reformation, for the celebration of All-Souls’ Day: so, in this following All-Saints’ Day, he traces a belief at that time, that All-Saints should reach unto All-Souls; or, a recognition that in their view, God’s purpose should reach to the salvation of *all* men: pp. 45, 46. It is also to be noticed, that he supposes the different times at which the first-fruits were to be gathered, and the use made of the number seven—(as applied to days, weeks, months, and years,) to refer to successive “ages;” and that the year of jubilee, or fiftieth year,—which he calls “the great Pentecost,”—symbolized the *general* redemption for *all* men, *i. e.*, Universal Salvation.

We pass on now (2) to consider what he says concerning “the doctrine of the aeons,” to use Mr. Cox’s word; or in Mr. Jukes’s own language, that this purpose of redemption “is fulfilled in successive worlds or ages.” (p. 148.) In making this statement, he is somewhat diffident: as he says (p. 40) he “would perhaps be exceeding his measure,” when speaking of the ass being

redeemed by the lamb ; so here (p. 51) he says “it would far exceed his measure to attempt to shew how the law in all its ‘times,’ figured the Gospel ‘ages’” He does, however, give us an instance and sample of such an elucidation, when he tells us his idea concerning the different times assigned for the purification of a woman after child-birth, according as she had given birth to a male, or a female child. He allegorises it thus : “If the woman, which is our nature, give birth to a man-child, or receive the seed of the word of truth, in *this* age ; then there is hope that even ‘our vile body,’ shall be cleansed, when we reach the end of this present dispensation ; but if its (*i. e.* our nature’s,) fruit, is a female child, or merely natural, instead of the ‘new man,’ then it is unclean double that time.”

But there is a very apparent difficulty connected with this hypothesis, as the enquiry is made, “who is responsible for such a result ?”—(*i. e.* the bearing of a man, or a maid child). Is it the woman ? So says Mr. Jukes. But evidently it is not true of the type, as he considers the woman to be.

We know very well, that it is no choice of hers, but God’s will or appointment; ergo, if we carry out his analogy, our nature *i.e.*, *we*, are *not* responsible as to how we treat God’s word when we hear it. It is not our fault, if we believe not ; and the result will be, in consequence of our mishap, or rather of *God’s appointment*, that we shall not be cleansed or saved, at the end of this age, but at the end of *another* ! That is, we shall be punished for that which we cannot help ! Yea, more than this:—perish the thought ! be *punished*

of God, not for our own doings, but His disposal!! The monstrosity of such a conception, is evidenced by the monstrosity of the result. What has Mr. Jukes's fancy given birth to! In endeavouring to define the character of God's *mercy*, he makes Him to be gratuitously *cruel* and *unjust*! But we must trace his hypothesis still further. He says, that those who do not receive seed in this life, and are not here purged, will be so hereafter: *i.e.*, in Hades.

Let us however remark, that he only conceives it to be possible, not certain, that the righteous will be fully purged in this life. Some may, but not all. That is, they will *not* have done with trial and pain when they leave this world! They will, however, be employed in Hades, in teaching, judging, and interceding for the wicked—"their younger brethren."

Such may reconcile them to further purgation, so Mr. Jukes conceives: pp. 81-84. So Mr. Cox (Sal. Mundi pp. 188 & 189.) So he, (Mr. Jukes,) explains the sentences against Moab, Ammon, and other nations. After a time the interdict was removed.

So, he finds no difficulty with those passages, as he says "called difficult." 1 Pet. 3:18-20, 1 Pet. 4:6. Christ, he says, preached to them in ἀδης, so will the saints, his people. In another place I shall refer to this. See Pt. ii. ch. 9, Probation in Hades; also Appendix Pt. ii. Note. In those places, what is common to Universalism and Materialism, will be duly considered.

It remains now (3) to examine Mr. Jukes's view of the "second death."

Here, in Mr. Jukes's definition of the radical idea

contained in the Scripture use of the word "death," I am happy to be able to say that I am quite agreed ; it quite answers to what I have set forth in another place, (Book II. ch. 4;) and in the appendix thereto, I shall quote Mr. Jukes's words, verbatim. It is only needful here, to give a synopsis of them. He says, that in Scripture, "death" simply means *separation* from a previous state of being or existence ; so that "death," as applied to the *body*, separates the soul from it, and from the things of this visible world. The same may be, and is, applied to God, and also to sin. So, in either, or any case, it includes a change of condition. It may be good, or bad, but it does not include annihilation. So far, all is well and true. But now, to Mr. Jukes's *use* of this. He says, that "all *advance* of life is through change, death, and dissolution." This makes death in the aspects considered, to be not only *necessary*, but also *beneficial*. So, death is not an *evil*, it is a *good*.

Mr. Jukes says truly, that the only way to life is through death ; (that is to *sin*,) but when he applies this to the disembodied state of the ransomed sinner, it is only as a part of his hypothesis, and without authority from the Word of God.

Thus he says, "there are fires for the elect even now and in the coming day; for, 'our God is a consuming fire,' and to dwell in Him we must have a life which, because it is of the fire, (for fire burns not fire,) can stand unhurt in it." (p. 81.)

Thus, it is not alone the Spirit's work in us now, that purifies the people of God, but according to Mr. Jukes, this is carried on also in another world, at least

in some cases, or degree, even with the righteous; more particularly is this so with the wicked, who, because they *will not* die to sin here, *must* die to it there. So (p. 83) he says, "As with the 'first-fruits,' so with the harvest. The world to be saved, must some day know the same baptism." So, (p. 84) he says, (interpreting the words literally here, and inconsistently with his own premiss,) "it is written 'As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive ;' (1 Cor. 16 : 22)—but not *at once*, but through successive ages." So he says, that the glories of those so saved at last, "the last," shall not be inferior to those of the "first-born." The reason he gives is, that Christ is both the First, and also the Last !! But in order to this, (he delivers to us this strange and dark doctrine,) they are to be delivered to Satan, in the intermediate state, "because they will not learn now, they are to be disciplined by evil." (p. 88). He then tells us, that he "cannot even attempt to trace all the stages or processes of their judgment," which he so thoroughly believes in, and which he has elaborated so far; and probably all who read this, will think that he has gone far enough already; as he has gone very far away in his mystical speculations, from the Divine Word, as many others of his school have done before him. I think it unnecessary to weary the patience of the reader by further quotations. Sufficient to say, that he so amplifies his meaning concerning the "second death," as applied to the wicked; that he leaves us in no manner of doubt, as to his teaching, that it means, to them, a curative punishment, in undergoing which, they shall be compelled to accept the Gospel, and finally be saved : pp. 91-95.

CHAP. V.

“Object of Election, and the true function of Punishment.”

I now proceed to consider Mr. Cox's statements concerning each of the above topics. With the latter, we may join what he says concerning “the doctrine of Retribution.”

1. Of the “Object of Election.” His point here is somewhat different from that of Mr. Jukes in dealing with the same matter. Both wish to prove that the saints are the means of saving the wicked; not in this world, but in the intermediate state, that is in Hades; so also, not *part* of those who are now, or were unbelievers, but the *whole*. Mr. Jukes afterwards applies this principle, not only to men, but also to devils! He arrives at his point by allegorizing interpretation, and so makes one of the two thieves crucified with our Lord, to represent Adam, the other Lucifer. I do not stop to discuss the question of the *transformation* in the latter case. Mr. Jukes deals with this matter of the elect and their works, as a *dogmatic fact*; while Mr. Cox proceeds to speculate upon the Divine purpose, in the fact of an election, as declared, taught, or illustrated in the Word of God. He draws inferences therefrom, agreeable to his own hypothesis, but plainly contrary to the teaching and analogy of Holy Writ. Thus, of individual election, he says that Abraham was chosen, that in him, “all the families of the earth

should be blessed." So of nations ; one is chosen for the salvation of all.

This however, while it declared a blessedness in opportunity extended, knowledge bestowed, and privilege so vouchsafed; does not include, and we know by analogy of Holy Writ, did not contemplate the actual, inevitable, and necessary possession, or inheritance of eternal life, herein conveyed to *all men*. God truly said to Abraham, (1) "in *thee* shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Gen. 12: 23.

This we may regard as the operation of a natural law of *character*. Abraham's eminent faith, as it blessed him ; thereby made him a qualified means of "being a blessing."* So, for this reason, (2) "his seed," lineally, were chosen as the channel whereby, "He should come forth who was to be the Ruler in Israel," a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the "glory" of the chosen nation ; so chosen and privileged, in accordance with God's moral and natural law of character, the law by which He governs,—and in accordance with which He judges,—moral agents, and in which His sovereign will is made to harmonize with the law of human accountability. So, also the Law, the natural and necessary

* Parallel with this passage, is Gen. 28 : 14, where the promise is renewed to Isaac, an heir of Abraham's *faith*, and so of Abraham's promise.

Abraham and Isaac were, in themselves, blessings to mankind, by the natural and moral law of character ; so also the wicked, by the same law, are curses to the world they live in. The righteous are blessings, objectively, to all, in the way of testimony and moral influence ; subjectively and effectually, blessings to the moral agents who choose to be benefited thereby ; while to those who refuse to be so, there is a double debt of accountability, for such *means* of blessing.

law of God's moral governance, that honours and rewards the righteous in such election, does only so certify against, as so it recognizes and combats, the observation of a similar, natural and necessary law, by which moral *evil* works in the world; and on account of which, it is combated, and the moral agents allied therewith, are condemned to a just judgment.

In like manner, the positive blessing and privilege, conferred by *means* of Abraham's "seed," the which St. Paul by Divine inspiration and authority, defines and declares to be, "not of *seeds* as of many, but as of *one* ; and in thy *seed*, which is Christ;" the Revelation of Christ, and His coming, His sacrifice, death and resurrection, were indeed to be a *proffered good* to all men; not an effectual and inevitable, nor a mechanical, as opposed to a moral and *chosen salvation*.

A similarly false and strained exegesis, contrary to the analogy of the faith, is seen where he so interprets St. Paul's words, "and so all Israel shall be saved;" as to apply it to all the nation of the Jews, when it is manifest from what he says elsewhere, (Rom. 4: 13, 14,) that the "all Israel" which he contemplates, is the whole elected company from all nations.

I do not deny by this, that there are in God's Word, great blessings in store for the Jews as a nation. Undoubtedly, that nation as a nation is not cast away; but the restoration of that nation hereafter to the Divine favour, by no means includes the eternal salvation of every individual thereof, either in the past or in the future. Nor does it follow that by Christ the whole world shall finally be saved, if not in this world,

yet in the world to come; nor that the Jews already in Hades are there in process of conversion; nor that such was in St. Paul's mind when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans; nor that in view of the general teaching either of that Epistle or of Holy Writ at large, (therefore, by a just principle of exegesis, or by sound logic,) that the principle of universal salvation is contained in the Scripture doctrine of election, as taught by St. Paul, or by any other inspired writer.

2. We may now turn our attention to "The true function of punishment": as Mr. Cox defines it.

This, he says must, in every case be, and have for its object, the reclamation and final good of the offender.

He does not state this absolutely as a philosophical principle, but seeks to ground it upon the Word of God. Before we consider the passages which he selects to prove his assertion, let it first be noticed that he utterly ignores the broad distinction everywhere made in the Word of God, between God's chastisements, and His judgments. Much more is this distinction to be found between temporal chastisements, and final future judgment or retribution.

In fact, we read of such a *present* chastisement, as preventative of a future *retribution*: (1 Cor. 11: 31, 32; see also 1 Cor. 5: 5; and Isaiah 27: 7, 8.

The passage in Habakkuk 1: 12, at once describes the faith of the Prophet in God's character, and defines the people to whom the words belong. The dealings spoken of, are God's dealings with a favoured nation, described as God's first-born, or beloved people. So God chastened them as sons. His dealings with that

nation, describe His dealings with professed Christians; His Church, so privileged, in *this life*; but is there therefore no difference between His dealings *hereafter*, with such as “despise the riches of His goodness and forbearance and long suffering?” (Rom. 2: 4.) What is the declared end of those in whom *repentance* is not wrought thereby?

It is *judgment*—“indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish.” This is elsewhere amplified as to its character and duration. So, for instance, “Whosoever shall *fall upon* this stone, shall be broken, but on whomsoever *it shall fall*, it will grind him to powder.” (Matt. 21: 44.) The one refers to a moral and chosen act, of the *sinner, now*; the other to a retributive and final coercion and disposal, of the Supreme Judge and Lawgiver. So too, let it be remarked that there is no choice, in the interpretation of that and similar passages, but between *annihilation*, and *remediless punishment!* Certainly, neither of them are for the *good*, and *reformation* of the offender. The same will apply to the passage, Heb. 12: 5-11, as has been said concerning Habakkuk, 1: 12.

With regard to what Mr. Cox says concerning the law of Retribution, it is sufficiently answered here, and in chap. 2, where I have shewn at large, that the whole scope of Revelation gives progressive and accumulative testimony, to the Divine purpose of a lasting separation between the righteous and the wicked.

Before closing this chapter, I must say a few words concerning Mr. Cox’s view of the “unchangeableness of God,” and the “atonement of Christ.”

He describes the latter as "God's Eternal Passion." I will not here dwell upon what his saying involves concerning God's nature and being. I will confine myself to this point: Admitted, that the atonement is the effect of God's unchangeable love, it is also the effect of His unchangeable hatred against sin. God is eternally holy and just, as well as good.

"It pleased (צִדְקָה) the Lord to bruise Him," (that is His beloved Son) for us. So, He said that He would "delight over" (רִשְׁוִישׁ) the Jews, to punish them. Deut. 28: 63. God's love will never destroy man's free agency. He will neither bring saints to heaven by physical law, nor will He so bring sinners. Neither will He, nor does He, so force men to Hell, either by physical, or by moral law. If God is the author of the saints' salvation, the sinner is the author of his own perdition or ruin.*

It may be added, that having proved Mr. Cox's argument, with respect to election, to be unsound; his inferences, in such connection, from the unchangeableness of God and the atonement of Christ, fall to the ground, as illegitimate, without force, and inapplicable.

Having considered Mr. Jukes's scheme for universal salvation, as developed in his theory of the first-born

* So, I agree with Mr. Birks when he says that neither God's character, nor God's Word, require or declare that He will compel men to obey Him, and so be saved at last. That is, He will not so interfere with their free agency—they shall have the responsibility of their own future. So, I epitomize his oft repeated expressions to this effect. Yet, I am in doubt as to his actual position, in reference to the "first-born," and shall take occasion, hereafter, to notice some utterances which I think open to grave objection.

and first-fruits, and also what Mr. Cox has advanced as it stands related to that theory ; it will, I think, be fitting, having refuted their arguments therefor, to give a positive statement of what I regard as the teaching of Scripture, upon the subject of the first-born and first-fruits. To this I shall proceed in the next chapter.

CHAP. VI.

“Scripture truth concerning the First-fruits and First-born.”

I shall now endeavour to state this, as I view it, in a positive form.

(a) Of the first-fruits. It is needless to state the enactments of the Old Testament law as to such. They were to be offered to God, according to certain Divine enactments : (See Deut. 26 : 2.) 1. God required them from the Jews, as to the Jews He had revealed Himself. Natural religion is a basis of this claim, as the Apostle teaches, Acts 14: 14-18 ; but it is further enforced and made an incumbent duty by a knowledge of revelation. Specially was it so to the Jews, under the Theocracy, and as a nation peculiarly favoured of Him. As their National God, He commanded it after their entrance into the promised land. It was based

not only upon His actual, but upon His known ; His well known character.

(b) It was commanded that they should be *offered*, *brought*, and *presented* to Him. It was to be a voluntary and chosen act. So, they were offered to Him. And it may here be added that what was enjoined upon the nation, was in a similar way enjoined upon individuals ; (Prov. 3: 9, 10,) but there as in the law, (Numbers 15: 19-21; Deut. 26: 2-11,) the provision was for a free-will offering. The tithe was, as a *civil* enactment, *so* obligatory, but not so in the case of *individuals*, with the offering of the first-fruits.

(c) So, be it noticed, as a duty recognized, and as the expression of a sense of God's beneficence, as also an acknowledgment of His sovereignty, it was *accepted* of Him.

If the outward offering did not include what it was supposed and required to express, it was accounted of Him "a vain oblation." Such was His teaching in the infancy of His Church, concerning Himself, His character and moral government. It was in connection with lower and lesser good, but it led upward to Him, and pointed to better things for them, while it embodied a practical principle applicable to all men, in all time.

2. But at a later period in the world's history, God's revelation of Himself takes another form.

The principle is unaltered, but its meaning is made more apparent. There is a development in the measure of truth, and a further manifestation, both of God's character, God's claims, and God's work. The antetype is evolved from the type. God's gifts are

manifested in a spiritual and higher form ; and man's acceptance and recognition of His character and grace, causes first-fruits, as represented by human hearts and human wills, the result of faith in His truth and love in Jesus Christ, to be offered freely to Him under the constraining power of His Spirit applying so great truth ; and so, such first-fruits of the Saviour's work and of the Spirit's power, are reaped by Him and accepted of Him. We mark a development, but no change of principle in God's revelation of Himself, and of His moral government. Although considerable, and even large numbers, believed, yet some believed not. (Acts 4: 1-4.) So it ever has been : so it will ever be. True it is, that Scripture leads us to expect a yet more mighty manifestation of God's power and love, His sovereignty and beneficence, in a more mighty Pentecost ; but He does not lead us to suppose, that even *then*, all will share in its lasting and spiritual benefit. While here is development of God's character, His supreme sovereignty and supreme beneficence ; there is clear evidence that under all, the law of dualism in human character and prospects, will be maintained throughout. The key-note of the first-fruits is *chief-good* ; God the *sum* of good, God the *receiver* of such, and God the *giver*. First, not in order of *time*, but in *character* and *quality*. God the *best* of all good to man ; and man giving to Him what He esteems *best*, the willing love and loyalty of the rational creatures whom He has made, and whom He has made provision to redeem, and whom, as believing such, of His beneficence and truth, He *has* so redeemed.

II. Of the “first-born.” The Greek word, *πρωτότοκος*, as generally employed in the New Testament, describes a *spiritual chieftaincy*, and not merely a priority of time and order, as Mr. Jukes would require it, by his theory, to do. It expresses, it is true, special legal privileges, as its analogical use requires ; but its special feature, as its foundation, is found in a peculiar endearment to God our Father. To trace it back to Old Testament use, in which the natural first-born is made a type, not only of the spiritual, but also of Him, by whom that spiritual, and so not merely temporal, but eternal privilege and endearment is merited and conveyed to us ; we may see that from the Fall, when the promise by the woman’s seed was made to Adam ; in a similar way, the first-born was in God’s order and appointment in nature, made that appointed type of spiritual chieftaincy, and special nearness, which (1) His own Incarnate Son should occupy in relation to Him ; and (2) those who, being spiritually His brethren, should be in Him, specially and peculiarly dear to His Father, in that they should be *so*, distinctively, the children of that Father.

So too, let us notice that in this analogy of the natural first-born; Christ is the elder brother, while His believing people are, and represent His own privileged condition. They are “first-born,” only in Him.

The phrase, as it is used in a spiritual sense, descends not lower, so as to imply the existence of younger children, *similarly* beloved as the elder, or first-born. Its spiritual use, does not contemplate a priority of time, but a priority of privilege, and chieftaincy of affection.

Yea, moreover we may say, that in this present state, in which *all men*, as sons of God, are in a state of probation, and in which, *character* is in process of moral determination; such answers to the *love*, which is plainly and dogmatically declared of God, First, and chiefly to those who, specially and distinctively are His children, by *new-birth*; and Secondly, to *all men*, whom He has loved, and as His children does so love, in that He has given His only begotten Son, in proof of His desire for their redemption. Yet, so subject to *their* individual action, in a voluntary reception of that salvation. Those are loved with a love of benevolence; these with a love of complacency. To attempt to trace a *perfect* analogy, here, as in the parables of our Lord, would land us in difficulty.

The salient ideas of the figure, are those to be regarded; and having determined as to such, we may not further press the figure, whereby natural things are made to represent things spiritual.

The law that the natural first-born should be redeemer of his brethren, comes within the limits which such a principle prescribes. It clearly points to Christ. To Christ as Messiah; First-born, not in order of *time*, but in special privileges and peculiar *regard*.

To follow the analogy of the natural first-born, if we admit it to imply that the younger are also loved of the parent, and that such there are; it does not deny the principle, that there is a difference in the *kind*, as well as the degree of that love, so far as it relates to the *character exhibited*. More than this, if during such probation and relationship to God, by *reason* of

such probation, the wicked are yet treated of God, and their brethren, as *sons*, such probation being continued, and in progress ; it does not at all imply that there is no radical distinction existing *now*, nor that such relationship shall not terminate, when such probation is *ended*.

Yet further. This analogy is further proved as applicable, and our inferences just ; from the fact that God's dogmatic utterances do most plainly declare, such distinction and such absolute change of relationship.

Mr. Jukes says that Christ is first-born in two senses : "The first-born of every creature, (Col. 1: 15,) and "The first-born from the dead" : (Col. 1: 18.) We will therefore consider the two passages of Scripture that he quotes to support his interpretation, that the reference is in regard to priority of *time*. It is evident that in the first passage quoted, *πρωτότοκος* has the interpretation which I have before assigned it, (viz., that of headship, as best beloved,) in that the previous clause, of *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀράτου*, is explained by that which follows, *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως* ; that is, as He is the supreme God, He is Lord by Divine right of all creation. The same is afterwards declared with respect to His Messiahship, so that as He is Lord as Jehovah, He is also Lord as Redeemer of His Church, and as Head of His believing people. So, *κεφαλὴ*, is there, (Col. 1: 18,) equivalent to, and synonomous with *ἀρχὴ*, in the same verse ; "*ἀρχὴ, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*" ; and it is equally apparent that the clause also refers to a power and leadership, by reason of such resurrection. So, He is declared to be the Son of God,

with power: (Rom. 1: 3, 4,) and be it also observed, that there the phrase, "Son of God," has reference, not to His Divinity, primarily considered, but to His Messiahship; and to His humanity, as such Messiah, in accordance with Psalm 2: 7, "Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten Thee." In 1 Cor. 15: 23, where Christ, as first-fruits of the resurrection, is spoken of, the same is the leading idea; and not the first-fruits, as *gathered* of God.

Thus, Christ the first-fruits, or head, or chief; (the first-fruits were רִשְׁתָה, and so the top-most, highest, and most excellent, and such is the radical meaning in Deut. 26: 2; and as the "first fruits," not only as the *beginning*, but as of the *best* of the fruits, were so offered to Jehovah;) so *rose* from the tomb, and so it is said, "Christ the first-fruits, afterwards *they that are Christ's*, at His coming." His people's resurrection as a resurrection to glory, is the *purchase* of His own, and the result of their union with Him.

I consider also that that passage in Micah, (2: 13,) refers to the resurrection. "The breaker is come up before them, and they have broken up, and have passed through the gate and are gone out by it: and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them."

Thus, as I consider, reason has been fully shewn, both negatively and positively, against the theory for Universal Salvation which Mr. Jukes has elaborated, having for its foundation the idea of Holy Scripture as being, in its nature, a compound of the human and Divine elements; and by which theory the literal sense is

absolutely excluded, and in the course of its allegorical interpretation, Universal Salvation is found to be taught, in the law concerning the first-born and first-fruits. Not only has such been accomplished, but we have fully maintained the principle of orthodoxy, by which a radical and continuous dualism of character and condition, is declared to be the decided teaching of God's Revelation in Holy Scripture.

CHAP. VII.

Revelation and Moral Agency.

We now return to consider Mr. Cox's statement concerning the measure and degree of Divine Revelation, as related to man's accountability.

Mr. Cox considers that a very large number of the human race have had, and do now possess, but very little light, and so, (to use their oft-repeated phrase,) have not even "a fair chance" of being quickened into life.

Therefore, from these premises, irrespective it may be said of whether God has revealed such to be His purpose or not; God in order to be just, according to their conceptions of justice, *must* give to such, "another

chance," *i.e.*, another time and place of probation. It is true that Holy Scripture is recognized as a rule of judgment, but still it is to be "interpreted according to our reason and conscience;" and the conclusion is scarcely to be avoided, as I think it to be a "fair" one, that even "reason and conscience" is not appealed to, (in its proper place as corroborative and collateral testimony), but as the first and *ultimate* source, by which the question is to be determined: It is thus a foregone conclusion. It must be added, not only against facts, against natural religion,—our reason and conscience properly defined,—but also against the Supreme Being Himself. "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest *against God?*" But they say, we entrench ourselves here, and make it to be right for God to do that, which is sinful in a creature. We may reply, justly and truly, "You make that to be right which *you* decree so, and not what God so decrees, *ergo*, you make yourselves to be God." Again, they say, "Has not God created within us a sense of right and wrong, and is not that true, as well as Revelation?" Granted: A sense of right and wrong is God's work in man's heart, and this, connected with a knowledge of God's works in Nature, is Natural Religion; and to this, we are quite willing that you should appeal, to see and enquire, does it contradict Revelation. You must first, however, concede that this is itself, *a Revelation*. It is so, in itself considered, apart from any written or traditional record in the beginning of man's history, of God's dealings with him, or revelation of His character and will therein, as related to him.

You must also, as Theists, admit, that God having revealed Himself to man, it is a question to be decided by Him alone, as to what measure of Revelation of a supernatural character, should be accorded to man at any given time. He, and He alone, is the proper and authorized judge. His will is both *right* and *good*; else, what? But, as a matter of fact, neither Universalists nor Materialists are willing to give that place and value to Natural Religion, ("our reason and conscience,") which really and truly belongs to it. Mr. Heard (Tri-Part Nature of Man, p. 32,) would have Butler's 2nd chapter blotted out.

Mr. Cox considers, not alone that Natural Religion, ("the light which is in thee," spoken of by our Saviour,) is of very little help to man, but even the *reflection*, if we say no more, of revealed religion possessed by the heathen, and the connection, more or less close, into which they have, in God's plan of moral government, been brought with those whom He had made for the time custodians of His truth, has actually been of little benefit to them; as, because they have not heard the Gospel, (that is, they have not lived in the Christian era,) they have not had "a fair chance" of being quickened into life.

He utterly ignores what the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, (Heb. 4: 2,) that "the Gospel *was* preached to *them*, as well as to *us*; but it did not profit them, not being mixed with *faith* in them that heard it." I suspect that *here* is the root of the difficulty, and not as Mr. Cox supposes, in an insufficient degree of light. The confession "*video meliora, proboque,*

deteriora sequor,” is only a confession of those, who, in any age, or under any light, are disobedient unto God. Thus, the inferences drawn by Mr. Cox concerning what is “a fair chance,” and what is the actual position of those who have a lesser degree of light, and their capability of undergoing a just judgment, is, *not* in view of God’s Revelation of Himself, “in our reason and conscience;” but in view of that blind mind in the “natural man,” which “is *not* subject to the law of God, (written, or unwritten,) neither indeed can be.”

But we must examine Mr. Cox’s position a little further. The question resolves itself thus:—Is man’s *capability* of receiving grace, regulated by the degree of supernatural revelation vouchsafed by God in the age in which he lives; and so his amenability to Divine judgment; or does it rest with, and is it regulated by a moral faculty *within*, which, though it has greater or less *degrees* of light, is yet, under such economy of the all-wise so ordained, and, in connection with an available help from on High to act in accordance with knowledge given—the *responsible* arbiter of its own destiny? Is man, as a responsible moral agent, to be won, governed, and judged by moral law, or is he, practically, as an automaton, to be acted upon by supernatural power, or by that power coerced into *ultimate* obedience to His commands, and at last *rewarded* for so, doing, when he did it not of his own *choice*? In short it amounts to this, neither more nor less. “Is man, so far a free agent in this his fallen condition, as to be morally responsible?” If he *is* so responsible, it holds true under any conditions as to *degree* of light; and if

being responsible and free as to his course of life, he so refuses to obey in one state of probation; why may God be bound to give him another?

Mr. Cox admits that many disobey God, even under Gospel light, in this age. Yet they, it would appear, who have had "a fair chance," are to have another, and are finally to be coerced into obedience. This, however, is only an exegetical conclusion from a previous hypothesis, which, making one probation insufficient, whether under revelation or natural religion, requires another. It all results from that arbitrary interpretation of 1 Tim. 4: 10, which, claiming to interpret Revelation, "by our reason and conscience," does actually invalidate, not only natural religion as a just basis of judgment, but also Revelation itself. So he says, (p. 14) "If these ancient sinners would have repented unto life, had the mighty works of Christ been done in their streets, why were they not done?" His own answer is, that since they would not learn by grace, they should learn by judgment, in suffering the second death. That is, they should finally, by suffering, be compelled to obey, and so be made willing. But, if God, consistently with His plan of salvation, could *finally* so coerce men; why not do so without such suffering? So, "our reason and conscience" may argue; but let it suffice that He has not told us that He will do so, (*i.e.*, coerce them by suffering,) but quite the contrary, as we have seen. (Chapt. 2.)

We may properly ask these questions with regard to God's moral Government.

1. Has God *always* given *some* light to man

concerning Himself and His will? The answer is plain, and cannot be disputed. He has.

2. Is *great* light necessary to salvation? or, is man's willingness to serve God *increased* with the increase of light?

3. Will God's future judgment of men, be regulated by the opportunities given to them? *i.e.*, will there be a corresponding ratio, in rewards and punishments, severally considered, in view of man's *action* upon such *opportunities* so given?

"Our reason and conscience" may require the above, and the Revelation of God's will tells us that such *will* be the rule of His judgment. Both agree that He will, as "Judge of all the earth," "do right."

But Mr. Cox's argument takes two forms.

1. Revelation by Miracles.

2. By Truth.

So we will consider the *second* question just proposed. 1. Of Revelation by *miracles*. Miracles, Mr. Cox says, are a means of grace, yea, "a *great* means of grace! they *tend* to bring, and are designed to bring, men to repentance and so to life." (p. 19.) So says Mr. Cox. But what are the facts of the case? What effect had the miracles of Egypt upon Pharaoh and the Egyptians? Did they not harden their hearts? Exodus 7: 23; 8: 15, 19; 9: 34, 35. Yea, the *more* as the miracles and God's forbearance increased! Is it not true also, that although miracles, like "tongues," are "a sign for them that *believe*, and not for them that *believe not*," yet the congregation of the children of Israel, as a *whole*, forgot God's wondrous works in

Egypt, the Red Sea, and in the Wilderness ; and the reason of their doing so was, “ because they believed not ? ” Heb. 3: 18, 19.

So, also are we told, that the miracles done by our Lord, in no wise caused the Scribes and Pharisees to believe on Him. St. Peter (Acts 2: 22) urged it to their *reproof* and *condemnation*, and so, all God’s Revelations are a cumulative charge against those who know and disobey them. So do we read, (Rev. 16: 8, 11,) that the wicked in the last days, under the exhibition of God’s power and judgment, “ blasphemed the God of Heaven, because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds,”—“ and repented not to give Him glory.” Surely we need say no more about the converting power and influence of miracles. We need no more to combat the unfounded assertion that “ they *tend* and are *designed* to bring men to repentance, and through repentance to life ! ”

We may therefore proceed 2, to consider the effect of a great degree of truth upon sinners, and enquire is this more efficacious ? There is, however, one more matter in connection with miracles, although not directly connected with Mr. Cox’s argument therefrom, which I must notice. He says truly, that the tendency of the present day is to depreciate the value and force of miracles. There is an endeavour to do so, as it is one aspect of the present attack upon Revelation. Mr. Cox (sparingly) *deprecates* it, although he admits it to be “ in the true line of advance.” Why does he do so ? The answer I fear is too plain. It interferes with his hypothesis concerning the value and efficacy of miracles as “ a great means of grace.”

Mr. Cox vents his sadness, or shall we say indignation?—that God should not have done the best to bring Tyre and Sidon, and Sodom and Gomorrha to repentance. “It irks and saddens us, he says,” and “it seems hard and *unjust*, that a man’s salvation, a man’s *life*, should hang on the age into which he is born,” (p. 15.) So, (p. 21) he gratuitously infers that Socrates and others, not having heard Christ’s words, are to be damned for not having heard them, or rather that we say so, and retorts upon us with virtuous indignation, for so saying. But who says so? Do Orthodox Theologians say so? Does natural religion say so? or does God’s Holy Word, as we receive it? By no means!

He indulges in a rather uncharitable, as a gratuitous conjecture, that those who interpret Scripture differently from himself, would, were they less favoured than they are, allow the argument which they *now* use to have little weight with themselves. (p. 22.) He congratulates himself that “the dogma of eternal torment,” or that there is no probation beyond the grave, is now held by very few, (pp. 23-24,) and he tells us in the preface, that “few of the more thoughtful and cultivated preachers of the Gospel,” now hold such doctrine, and “in a large circle of acquaintance, he hardly knows of one!” So, too, he flings a stone at Lot, by saying that he was no Jonah even, and reproaches him for standing in the way of sinners, to secure a fat inheritance.” All this is special pleading. Lot’s wordliness is not excused by us, nor by God’s Holy Word, nor by the fact of God’s dealings with him; yet, although He chastened him severely, He recognizes a radical

distinction between him and the Sodomites, declares him to be “a righteous man,” and that “his righteous soul was vexed from day to day with their unlawful deeds.” (See also the following verse.) The *object* of all this is to deprecate the sin, and so the responsibility of the inhabitants of the cities of the plain, and to secure for them “another chance.”

Now let us first ask, is it not a fact of Revelation, that the *choice* in the face of light, of a principle and practice, (or of a supposed good,) contrary to the Word, will, and character of Jehovah and His promises ; is not such a determinate *choice*, the sin which is chargeable, and *charged* of God against man ? Did not our Lord say of Jerusalem, “ O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how oft would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings, and ye would not ! ” It was not *once*, but *often* : and the condemning charge was, that under any and all circumstances of light, they *would* not. What was true of such, as a nation, was true in their individual capacity : is true of *all* the disobedient, in *all* times. True it is, that our Lord attached a special condemnation to those who sinned under the Gospel, (John 3:36,) but it only goes to shew, that such condemnation was *cumulative* ; and that even all the wisdom and grace of the Almighty, by which He appealed to moral agents by moral law ; was, and is, opposed by an inveterate and persistent “ law of sin ” in man’s mind, which is enmity against Him.

Against such a moral principle of *evil*, God opposes a moral principle of *good* : of truth and wisdom.

Still, while He has, as a fact, made His Revelation progressive, and also discernible to man's mind, enlightened by such Revelation and by His Spirit, as a fact of supreme wisdom and beneficence in relation to the *end*; still, as a moral governor, God *will* not, even so, bestow light so as to neutralize the moral agency and responsible will, with which He has endowed man. Were such to be the case, there could be no *probation*; and virtue would cease, under such circumstances, to be virtue.

So we interpret that passage, Matt. 11: 20-24. God would, in his bestowing of truth to those guilty cities, conserve their moral agency, as He will judge them in accordance with it; and with the *degree* of light which, in *His* wisdom, He saw fit to give to them.

It is a fact, admitted by most men, that they know more of what is good, than they practice. So, it is in fact, a mercy of God that He has so gradually bestowed the means of knowledge. Although a larger measure, in earlier times, would have given more comfort to *some*, yet God has regarded the condition and interests of *all*. *

It is a well known and accepted fact that Gospel truth is very hardening, where it is not *received*. It is not therefore, in itself, a mechanical, and necessarily

* The following quotation from the Life of Mrs. Judson, as an experimental fact, is in point here, and of value: "A few days after this, as I was reading Bellamey's True Religion, I obtained a new view of the character of God. His justice, displayed in condemning the finally impenitent, which I had *before viewed as cruel*, now appeared to be an impression of hatred to sin, and regard to the good of beings in general.

efficacious, although a highly spiritual agency. The radical enmity that *opposes* it, is not of the head, but of the heart and will. (See 2 Thes. 2: 11-12.)

Here then, in the regeneration and salvation of the sinner, is another high mystery. It is the Creator meeting the creature, as an individual, in the secret chambers of the heart and conscience, although by truth, and there dealing with him! *God* the Sovereign: yet no less truly, *man*, the responsible and moral agent, the moulder and determiner of his future destiny!

It only finds a parallel in the same truths, set forth everywhere, concerning the same God. "The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, yet who will by no means clear the guilty."

So of the very *rudiments* of His religion. He that cometh to God, must *believe* (not know by demonstrative philosophy,) that *He is*, and that He is the *rewarder* of such as diligently *seek* Him."

What he said to Jacob's seed, that they should not seek His face in vain; what He says by Solomon (Prov. 2: 1-5,) "If thou seekest her (*i.e.*, God's truth) as silver and searchest for her as for hid treasure, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God;" this is true of all men, and in all time: such shall find Him, as He has provided and as he has promised. Yea, even under the most unfavourable conditions, "if they seek Him with their whole heart." The sad circumstances with which prevailing vice has compassed about many, even in our own day, and in our own favoured father land, (referred to by Mr.

Cox, p. 16,) can form no exception, when we have in view the fact, that God's rule of judgment is according to knowledge and opportunity; and although the disadvantages and sorrows of such a condition be great, our unfailing clue for the solution of all hard problems of the moral government of a just and good God, is found in the assured truth of His Word, as well as our just, intuitive, and revealed intelligence of His character; that it shall be always, and certainly, according to the most perfect truth, and the most perfect beneficence.

CHAP. VIII.

“The restitution of all things.”

I have already, in a positive form, answered the question which Mr. Cox has attached to the title of his book, “Is Christ the Saviour of all men?” In the title, *Salvator Mundi*, he says yea! and doubtless to others he suggests the question, “Is it not so?” I think that I have already shewn from Holy Scripture, *how* He is “the Saviour of all men,” and also *how*, and in what respects that is a particular and special salvation which He gives “to those who believe.” It remains now to give a positive statement of what I regard as the doctrine of Scripture, concerning “the

restitution of all things." This phrase of Holy Scripture, Mr. Jukes has adopted as the title of his book, and in so adopting it, he makes a sad perversion of the truth therein contained, and expressed in other places of Holy Writ.

Here again, let us notice, that Mr. Jukes violates that canon of interpretation, which he has laid down for himself, in his view of "the nature of Scripture." He commits himself absolutely to the figurative sense, and rejects the literal as the human element in Revelation. The truth (he says) does not lie upon the surface. "The mystery of the Incarnate Word, I am assured, is the key, and the only sufficient one to the mystery of the Written Word: the *letter*, that is the outward and human form, of which answers to the flesh of Christ, and is but a part of the mystery of the incarnation of the Eternal Word." "The Divine is revealed under a *veil*, and that veil a creature form." (Rest. of all things, pages 41-5.) The "creature form," therefore, the "veil," or the "human body," is the *literal sense*. This veils the Divine Revelation. Consequently, it is uniformly and *always* to be excluded, in the interpretation of Holy Scripture.

This, I think, is inevitable from the premiss which Mr. Jukes has laid down for his own guidance. Yet, here, what do we behold! Mr. Jukes, instead of excluding, does actually admit the literal sense, "the veil," "the human element." How inconsistent! How inadmissible from his own premiss! But more cogent than this, how utterly at variance with the analogy of faith, and the explicit statements of the Word of

God, as he here makes use of the literal sense in the most *absolute* way !

Actually, and truly, both Mr. Jukes and Mr. Cox do make a sad perversion of the sense of Scripture, with reference to this little word, " all." Truly it is indeed " all" of the things and persons to whom reference is made, and who or which, are contained under that description; but to say that it is in this case, *universa*, absolutely, in the most general and unrestricted sense, of things in this world, (to extend it no further,) is quite contrary to what is disclosed as the mind, or *intention of the sacred writers*. The latter is far more important, and rests upon a much surer foundation than Mr. Jukes's air-spun theory of the "veil and revelation." The principle referred to is quite akin, although not absolutely identical with, another very important principle of Scripture interpretation, *i.e.*, regard to the *usus loquendi*. One refers to the scope embraced in the thought of the writer, or writers, and the general agreement of their testimony, in reference to that *particular* subject; the other refers to the *use* made of *language* by such writers, to express ideas, and their agreement in such use, where such agreement is found, or in whatever degree. The principle contained in the latter, as contrasted with an arbitrary stress upon Etymological derivation, is a prime and important element in the present controversy. But to return to the word " all." As interpreted by Mr. Jukes, it might, in that phrase, "the restitution of all things," apart from the context, and as adopted to express *his* ideas of universal salvation, extend to things and persons

beyond this world; and so indeed he does apply it, for he makes it to refer to the salvation of *devils*. But let us now seek the just and proper view of facts, as Scripture sets them forth, in reference to "the restitution of all things."

The context directs us, as to the scope thereof. It is of "which God has spoken by all His holy Prophets since the world began." One great and cardinal truth we learn from this: It is, that it has reference to Prophetic revelations of the Divine purpose, not to *ceremonial enactments*, covering as a "veil," a secret purpose and plan of Eschatology, or a description of the method of God's moral government. Having ascertained this, it, alone, lets in a flood of light as to the meaning of the phrase. We will endeavour to trace the testimony referred to, in the most strict agreement with the terms prescribed by the text. Such speaks of "all God's Holy Prophets," from the beginning. It is evident that the Divine promise in the day of the Fall, cannot be included in this statement. It refers to Prophets. Now St. Jude directs us to the first in this royal line of Prophets, when he says that "Enoch, the seventh from Adam," gave prophetic testimony as to the times of the end. We can go back no further. Let us then first notice the *character* of the testimony referred to. Does it speak of the Salvation of all men? Does Enoch say that God intends in the future "restitution," to *restore* the rebellious and disobedient? Most emphatically he says, No! Such testimony makes no promise of that nature—it is of judgment most severe and certain. "Behold the Lord cometh with ten

thousands of His saints, to execute judgment upon *all*, and to convince all that are *ungodly* among them, of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him." Jude 14, 15. These words are very decided, and very pertinent to the matter in hand. Here, we have "all" presented to us from another point of view. Does this mean *all* persons, absolutely and unreservedly?

No! it means all the *ungodly*; as, in Acts 3: 21, the "restitution" spoken of, refers to "all" the *righteous*. Dualism of character and condition. Such shall be finally re-arranged and put in order, each in "his own place." Let us also notice how such judgment, spoken of by Enoch, and made known to us by St. Jude, is associated with that "blackness of darkness for ever," *εἰς τὸν αἰώνα*, spoken of in the previous verse. This corresponds to the *δεσμοῖς ἀιδίοις* spoken of in verse 6, when treating of the same "judgment" executed upon devils for their presumptuous rebellion.

It needs not that we pursue the subject here, with reference to the *duration* of such judgment; it suffices that the principle of a *διάκρισις* is established, in contra-distinction from a salvation which embraces *all*.

The "restitution" spoken of, has both a negative and positive aspect. The negative aspect, inasmuch as such restitution is with special reference to the people of God, who at present "cry out of violence and wrong;" has for its character a manifestation of *judgment*. It is in view of the fact that "the earth is given into the hands of the wicked," because wickedness is the ruling

principle, the principle of the majority. The "restitution of all things," is spoken of from this point of view, and with a special reference to these facts. So it is a synonymous term, with what our Lord terms "the *regeneration*, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory." Here, however, (while it has the same reference,) it assumes a positive form. Of such negative form of judgment, I have spoken in chapter 2, and as the prophetic testimony referred to in the text quoted, Jude 1: 15, has in its earlier record, the record "of judgment to come" on "all that work wickedness"; we shall have to pass onward to those later records of the Prophets, who were inspired to write their prophecies, and have, in the Prophetic Scriptures, specially and distinctively so called, left us the special testimony of the Most High, of His purpose, in regard to such restitution. If we consider the word Prophet, in its normal signification, and not with its later reference to declaration by Divine authority of things future, and of events yet to come to pass, we might speak of those authoritative declarations which, as moral axioms and first principles, are set forth in the Book of Proverbs, and (in the Book of Job) recognized as accepted and incontrovertible truths, enforced in Nature and in the human conscience, that God will certainly, hereafter, reward the righteous and punish the wicked. But we will interpret the text in connection with the more restricted sense of the word Prophet.

"The Evangelical Prophet," Isaiah, is first in order; and in several places does he give most full and explicit

evidence concerning the good times,—the “times of refreshing,” in store for God’s people. I can only remark in passing, how the Negative and the Positive aspect of such restitution is mingled together, in his Prophecies. More frequent indeed are the places where judgment is spoken of; but, in places, the Prophet breaks out into joyous strains, as he tells of the future glories of God’s chosen. It is generally in direct connection with the coming of Christ’s Kingdom, and of His assumption of His kingly power. So, in the 10th and 11th chapters, where he speaks of the glory of His millenial kingdom, such restitution is plainly spoken of. So also, in chapters 25 and 26, immediately following the most solemn declarations of a future judgment on the wicked, does he tell of “the rebuke of God’s people being taken away from off all the earth.”

So, specially in chapter 35. “The wilderness and the solitary place, shall be glad for them”—so also, “the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: They shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.” So again, chapter 61 to the end of his Prophecy, may be said to be taken up altogether with this glorious theme:—the good things in reversion for God’s people,—and the punishment of their enemies,—of the wicked.

With reference to that millenian reign of Christ, in connection with whose second advent to our world, the Scripture doctrine of Restitution is found; it is intimately associated with the future of the Jewish nation, as a nation, and with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in

the latter days, of which the world has as yet seen but the earnest. Such, we have every reason, from the teaching of Holy Scripture, to believe. Yet, while the gifts and calling of God are here, as in the case of individual *believers*, without repentance; such restitution is only contemplated, or declared as in connection with, a *regenerated* people.

So, are we to regard all those places in which their future glory is spoken of, as Jer. 30 & 31; and in 31: 2, where the literal Israel is spoken of, it evidently includes all that people, who are "surnamed," and "subscribed unto the Lord;" *i.e.*, by regeneration and faith in the God of Israel, made partakers of that salvation, which He has reserved for *all* His elect and chosen ones.

So also, the declaration in Jer. 31: 11—that "the Lord has redeemed Jacob, and ransomed him from the hand of him that was stronger than he," is thus to be understood and regarded. Chapters 32 and 33 are to be read with the same signification. They do not indeed exclude, but chiefly contemplate, the Israel according to the flesh, or the Jewish nation; but neither do they exclude, but they also contemplate that people, who are in truth, in their individual character and position, what Israel as a nation and people did but typify, afore time: for, as St. Paul says, "they that are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham"; (Gal. 3: 7) and so our Lord's language to that people, plainly intimates.

So that, here we see what is the character of the "restitution" spoken of. It has reference to an elect and chosen people, for whose benefit and relief it is

designed, as well as for a vindication of God's character and truth. This has long been doubted of by the many. They have doubted God's truth, His power, and His love. "When His hand has been lifted up they would not see; but, says the Prophet, they shall see." They have said, and still say, "Where is the promise of His coming?" So our Lord says, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?"

Our Lord's promise to His waiting Church, to His patient and obedient people, "to those who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for a glorious immortality"; are, that they shall hereafter reign with Him. So, Matt. 19: 28, so, Rev. 6: 9, 10, so, St. Paul reminds Timothy. Tim. 2: 2, 11, 12. This too, our Lord declares in Matt. 5: 5, where the promise of inheriting the earth, plainly, by the analogy of faith, relates to such restitution. Such a state of things, without doubt, is different from that now existing. So, although this Millenial reign of Christ is what is first pointed to, as the inception of the future state of blessedness reserved for the godly; something more, and higher, follows it, where He says, that in that great and decisive day, which is subsequent to the earthly reign of Himself and of His saints; that then He will confess them before the assembled retinue of Heaven: yea! more than that, for they, as members of Christ, shall sit with Him to judge that same world which before had judged and condemned them, as it was opposed to their Master; and with them, also, those rebellious angels, and their great leader Satan, who is the ruler of this present world, and who now works in the children of disobedience,

as he reigns in them, by sin. This is the culmination of the glory spoken of in Scripture, as belonging to the saints, and this, too, is the culminating point of that restitution which Scripture teaches. It is also, and therefore, as it relates to them, and is spoken of in such connection, the making "all things new." How, and in what respect, our Lord declares by his beloved disciple St. John; Rev. 21: 1-5, specially 3, 4, and 5. "And I heard a great voice out of Heaven, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things have passed away." So also ch. 7: 13-17, and Isa. 35: 10. The following quotations from the Prophets, are given as containing, with those before given from Isaiah and Jeremiah, the chief of Scripture and Prophetic evidence concerning the Millenial and future glory of the Church.*

They are, of course, too lengthy to be transcribed here. I may, however, quote some of the most pointed and specific testimony therefrom. Habakkuk 3: 14. "Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, even for salvation for Thine anointed; Thou woundedst the head out of the house of the wicked, by discovering the

* Ezekiel, 37, 38, 39, 40; Daniel, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12; Joel, 3; Amos, 9 and 11; Obadiah, 17, *ad finem*; Micah, 7; Nahum, 1; Habakkuk, 3; Zephaniah, 3: 14 to 17; Zechariah, 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14; Mal, 3: 13-18, 4: 1-3.

foundation unto the neck." Zechariah 3: 14-17. "Sing, O daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel; be glad and rejoice with all the heart, O daughter of Jerusalem. The Lord hath taken away thy judgments, He hath cast out thine enemy; the King of Israel, even the Lord is in the midst of thee; thou shall not see evil any more. In that day it shall be said to Jerusalem, Fear thou not; and to Zion, Let not thine hand be slack. The Lord thy God in the midst of thee, is mighty; He will save, He will rejoice over thee with joy; He will rest in His love, He will joy over thee with singing." Zechariah 13: 8-9. "And it shall come to pass that in all the land, saith the Lord, two parts therein shall be cut off and die; but the third part shall be left therein. And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: They shall call on my name, and I will hear them; I will say it is my people; and they shall say, The Lord is my God." Malachi. 3: 16-18. "Then they that feared the Lord spoke often one to another; and the Lord hearkened and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before Him, for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon His name. And they shall be mine said the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man that spareth his own son that serveth him. Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not." Here, again I may remark, is plainly manifested, that dualism of character, and of destiny, which is a prime feature in the history of

mankind, and of God's dealing with them. The "restitution of all things," which is to take place hereafter, is not to abolish that distinction, but to make it manifest. There is now and necessarily, a moral distinction; there will hereafter be a fitting, and manifest distinction, in their external circumstances and relations, and such will be a perfect and eternal distinction: one universally existing in all God's universe, and beheld to His glory, by all His creatures. So, will God's character be fully and finally vindicated. So, will its manifestation, therefore evoke the admiring praises of the Angelic hosts. "And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying great and marvellous are Thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are Thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear Thee O Lord, and glorify Thy name? for Thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before Thee; *for Thy judgments are made manifest.*" Rev. 15: 3-4. So, 16: 5 & 7. "Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are Thy judgments." So also, Rev. 19: 1-6. "Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

I have dwelt more especially upon the "restitution" spoken of in Holy Scripture, as it stands related to the righteous, and as opposed to the positive aspect of Universalism; but a consideration of the Scripture evidence, goes to prove most clearly and certainly, that in the statement there given, concerning such "restitution"; there is, and can be actually, no statement concerning the future of the righteous, which does not stand connected with the future of the wicked; the

principle of a dualism of character and condition in the history and prospects of men, is an essential element pervading the whole of Divine Revelation.

I wish but to make this point here, against Mr. Jukes's theory of Universal Restitution or Salvation ; (whichever name be used,) viz., that the Scripture statement of a restitution, is in the interest of the righteous *alone*, not of *all* men. It most certainly has been, is, and must be, to the pious and reflective mind, matter for wonder and adoration, that the holy God who stands revealed to us in Holy Writ, as the Maker and Moral Governor of the Universe, should, for so long ages, have tolerated and allowed such wide spread and diversified wickedness, to have such prevalence in His creation ; and with such inexpressibly painful and grievous results, to the world at large ; but especially to the "just" and "upright" man, as all facts of history, sacred and secular, go to prove. So indisputable and patent is the fact, that it is evident that through want of *faith* in the truth and character of Jehovah's government, the many are practically governed and controlled thereby. "Because judgment against an evil work is not executed *speedily*, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." The proud and perverse reasoning of the human heart cannot countervail God's testimony. The "voice within the heart," combines with the written testimony to declare, that "God shall judge the righteous and the wicked. To the righteous it says, "Surely there is an end and thy expectation shall not be cut off." "They shall not be ashamed that wait for me." The intuitions

of our moral nature, which are unerring, require that it shall be so, and so says the Word of God.

The incurable perversity, and the unreasonable character of unbelief, shew themselves here. In almost the same breath it says,—“Tush, God shall not see, and I shall have peace, although I go the way of my own heart.” In other words, in view of prosperous wickedness,—“God is not the Governor of the world”: and at the same time,—“God is the Saviour of all men.” In much the same way, has it been said, “It is inconceivable that the Maker of innumerable worlds, would send his Son to redeem this one;” and also,—“We will not have this man to reign over us.”

Of this, however, let us be assured, that as we believe in an All-Perfect God; the ways of that God shall, in “the restitution of all things,” which He has promised, be fully and forever justified. The hope of the righteous, and the fear of the wicked,—that fear which cannot be wholly got rid of,—alike agree with the explicit teaching of God’s Word written: (however it may be pleaded against,) that there is, and must be, an essential, manifest, and wide separation between good and evil, in the day that is coming.

“The fear of the wicked, it shall come upon him; but the desire of the righteous shall be granted.” Prov. 10: 24.

BOOK II.

—
CHAP. I.*Modern Materialism.*

We now enter upon the consideration of the second great divergence from Orthodox and Scripture teaching, as to Future Punishment.

I will only remark here, that we pass at once to the consideration of that theory which is termed Conditional Immortality. The school of Materialism pure and simple, in entire harmony with Tyndal, Darwin, and Huxley's pseudo scientism, is here eliminated from the subject matter of consideration; as little needing refutation, because exercising little influence with professed Christians.

The writers on the side of Conditional Immortality, now most prominently before the public, are the Revds. S. Minton, H. Constable, J. Heard, and E. White. The first-named gentleman is credited with having done most service to their theory. The names of the two gentlemen next enumerated, are well known; but as Mr. White's book is the most elaborate, and generally looked upon as a "classical authority," upon the subject;

I shall chiefly deal with it; referring to the works of the other writers, as occasion may seem to require.

It is only needful further to remark, that I do not here profess to deal with the scientific evidence, save in an incidental and corroborative form. As it is a subject without the limits of "philosophy," I cannot admit as valid argument, any view of the intrinsic merits of the case, as we are able to regard it. It is a question of Scripture exegesis, at least primarily, if not *absolutely*; the second place, we shall give to Natural Religion; and Natural Theology, or Science properly so called, may be looked upon as yet more subordinate and collateral testimony.

I might, therefore, entirely pass over those chapters of Mr. White's book in which he regards the subject from the standpoint of science. Although he discloses a strong bias towards the idea of evolution, he ultimately relinquishes it as untenable. There can be no doubt, that were it possible to demonstrate, that the life of man, physical and moral, was but an evolution from a similar life existing in the brute creation, their point would be made; and *death* as the annihilation of both parts of man's substance, as a compound being, if asserted by the God of nature, would not only *probably*, but *certainly* be demonstrable from that Revelation, of which also He is the Author. The former position, however, is *not* demonstrable. No department of Natural Science can be made to serve this end. There is an essential difference between the intelligence of animals, and man's mental and moral constitution.

The argument for analogy between the intelligence

or instinct of animals, and the mind of man, breaks down in a similar way, to that for a *diversity of origin* in the different branches of the human family. That is, as there is an unsurmountable *barrier* between genus and genus in the animals; so is there an essential difference between the instinct of the animals and the intelligence and moral faculties of mankind. Quite the *opposite* is the case, with reference to genus and species in man. In the language of Prof. Richard Owen: "Man is the sole species of *his* genus, the sole representative of *his* order." The facts of science, (notwithstanding appearances of analogy between them,) run counter to the hypothesis of evolution, or development from the animals to man, either as respects the material or psychical portion of their being. There is a well defined distinction between the *lowest* type of human intelligence, and the *highest* type of that of the animals, from which we are said to be "evolved."

There are several flaws in Mr. White's argument, from the subject of the first few chapters of his book, that must be noticed. He says, Geology tells us that our world bears in its crust a record of death, the age of which record, he admits, cannot be accurately determined; that is, whether before, or after the period when the Mosaic narrative may fairly be supposed to have commenced; still, however, he concludes that Adam had such an entire familiarity with the idea of death, *from this evidence*, that he could only understand the death threatened by God to himself upon disobedience, after a similar manner, namely: "the loss of *his* life as a man." But there are two difficulties in

the way of this theory. "The fossil evidences of death," which have come down to us, *may* have been *subsequent* to the Adamic period in their actual being; and if *anterior*, as we have no data to determine how long Adam was sinless after his creation; it cannot certainly be said that he was acquainted with such fossil evidences of death. As the world left the Creator's hand, he pronounced it "very good," and there is every reason to believe, that death in any form to the animal creation, only supervened when sin had entered; for we are told that under such a curse, "the whole creation groans and travails in pain together until now."

There is another great flaw in the argument of Mr. White, underlying the whole of his argument from Holy Scripture; that is, he *assumes* from the very slender information conveyed on the subject, by Biology and Psychology, that the human soul is not immortal in its nature, but like that of animals is perishable at death, although he is led to allow afterwards, when dealing with the argument from Holy Scripture, that it does *not* so perish actually. This further involves his theory in difficulty. If it does not so perish at death together with the body, as does that of the animals, or at least is *lost*, so that it is never more possessed by the individual organism, whatever becomes of it; then the *literal* meaning of the curse, "Thou shalt surely die," *i.e.*, lose thy being as a man, so as never to regain it, as in the case of the animals—this cannot stand. Furthermore, (although I here anticipate the Scripture argument,) Holy Scripture certainly teaches the conscious survival of the soul in

Hades ; this being so, how is it that it so survives ? Is it by a special decree of the Almighty, and that, only temporarily, in order that it may not only be subjected to suffering, but also after such infliction, adjudged of God, be then "killed," "destroyed," and made to "perish ?" If so, then the simple, *literal* meaning of "death," "destruction," "perish," "cut off," &c., becomes not a simple, but a *compound* one. More fatal to it as a system and interpretation of Scripture, it becomes a mere hypothesis, unsupported by proof of Natural Science, or of Revelation.

Is it not much more rational, more in agreement with the plain language of Scripture, involving less difficulty in its interpretation, because favouring its literal interpretation, where it properly admits of it, to suppose that it is from its own quality, with which it is endowed by God, that it so survives in a separate state from the body, whether it be in the case of the righteous or of the wicked ?

Although the information given us by Holy Scripture in relation to the subject, is but scanty ; we may not only say to Mr. White and his friends, "on you lies the *onus probandi* of a new theory on this subject, and your premiss, is in this, 'not admitted' ;" but we may, I think, proceed from the negative to the positive, and justly dwell upon the phraseology used in relation to the human soul : it was made in the "image of God" :— and so the destruction of human life, is made punishable both upon man and beast, for *this* reason. Further, it is said, that God "breathed into man's nostrils, the breath of life" ; phraseology that marks man's natural

nearness to the Deity in a special way. It is not said of any other part of His creation. It is fatal, as a fact of inspired truth, to the theory of evolution, as are indeed all positive facts relating thereto, derived from *science*; and on going therefrom to the discussion of this subject from the stand-point of *Holy Scripture*; we must fairly be credited with all the advantage derivable from science, in favour of our premiss in such argument, that the soul of man is, in its nature, and by the decree and appointment of its Almighty Maker, immortal: that is destined by Him for an endless life: the character of that life to be determined by "deeds done in the body." There is yet another flaw in the argument of Mr. White for the material and perishable nature of the human soul; that is, his argument is counter to one of the *intuitions of the human mind*.

By an intuition of the mind, man apprehends as a fact of his consciousness, as conscious to him as his present existence, that he has a future life to look forward to, and that for the character of that future, he is himself responsible. This expectation, it would appear, man has *ever* had, although philosophy cannot *demonstrate* it to be true; yet the voice of the Creator speaking in his moral nature, however that may be debased or darkened by sin, tells him that it *is* true. The moral argument for survival is unanswerable; and if this does not *necessarily* include immortality, it yet favours it; and when this is coupled with the deductions of science, it not only does not make for the soul's materiality, but it is in favour of the belief in its *immortality*.

CHAP. II.

Immortality of the Soul, and Philosophy.

A great objection is made to the received belief of the immortality of the soul, because that philosophic theories have been framed concerning it. Mr. Constable and Mr. White, both argue as if it had *no other* foundation. Therefore, before we enter upon the argument from the Holy Scripture, here will be the proper place to consider this objection.

Mr. White says, p. 208, "The assertion of man's natural immortality is the direct cause of a God-dishonouring theology, carrying with it generally the dogma of eternal misery, which has done more than any other notion to hinder men from coming to the living God for life eternal." They complain that the idea of an immortal nature "exalts man too much."

Mr. Constable says, p. 16, according to *it*, *i.e.* (Grecian Philosophy,) "The soul was possessed of inherent immortality, it had *no beginning* and could have no end." But surely he does not intend to say that Orthodox Christian Theology *asserts the same*? Were it so, we should indeed be open to *more* than Mr. White's charge of "a God-dishonouring Theology."

They comment on the evil that Philosophy has wrought in the Church; and argue as if the truth, here held, of the soul's natural immortality were absolutely dependent upon Philosophy, and asserted by it alone.

Here, however, are two errors, yea, we may say three. First, I will remark that a thing may be *true* that is not so demonstrable; the same is true of many things relating to God and His ways. In fact it is impossible to eliminate *supernatural* truth from religious faith; it is that which distinguishes it. Not, indeed, that religious faith is contrary to reason, but it is in many things *above* it. Is it not notably true, that even Theism *must* have Faith for its foundation, and not science pure and simple? “He that cometh to God must believe that He is”: *i.e.*, that He *exists*.

It is assuredly true that every argument by which the Divine existence, as a living Personality, is sought to be proved by Philosophy, runs into Pantheism. Is it therefore *not* true that God exists, and that He *so* exists? The same is true of the doctrine of the Trinity. Who can demonstrate to us the Philosophy of the Incarnation? His sinless conception when He became flesh? Who can demonstrate the fact of the Hypostatical union of the two natures in Him, who can only be properly described as to His nature, by His title of Messiah?

Who can sound the depths of that unfathomable mystery, the atonement; the *price* paid by our Surety, to Divine Holiness, for our *ransom*? It would appear that it is the ambition of the advocates of Conditional Immortality to do the latter, as they tell us that He *died* for us as a man, and the Godhead suffered! No wonder that Mr. Greg, in the *Contemporary Review*, proposed to dismiss all these sublime mysteries into *silence*, “as the most respectful, (and to them, most *convenient*) course!”

Therefore, all the arguments against the soul's immortality, from this source, is fallacy. But it is not only fallacy to argue against its truth because it cannot be philosophically demonstrated, but it is, (2,) also a fallacy to assert that *we build* our arguments upon Philosophy in *this* place, any more than in any other part of our doctrine. See ch. 13 "Pos. Results."

We distinctly repudiate such a premiss; we do indeed consider it necessary to show that we are supported by very good probable reasons, both from Natural Theology, from Natural Religion, and from God's Holy Word; and from this latter, we hope that we are able to bring more than *probable reason*, yea, as a fact of Divine Testimony, even demonstration, that it is the Divine will, that the souls of men shall continue to live after death without a *declared limit*; and from the terms employed in such connection, we are left almost without possibility of belief, as based upon any Revelation of the Deity; that the life, or existence of the wicked, will ever come to an end.

But, (3), the fact, as to the use of Philosophy in this controversy, is altogether against the advocates of Conditional Immortality. *They* it is, who use Philosophy as the basis of their system; they vainly seek to interpret Scripture, so as to come within reach of human ken in this matter. Mr. White's book is very clear evidence of this. Although he is reluctantly compelled to admit, that Science cannot solve the difficulty which he feels; still, he does, nevertheless, build his system of Scripture interpretation upon the inferences which Materialists have drawn from their "Philosophy," *falsely so called*.

Mr. White, I believe, feels that it is but an hypothesis that he is arguing for, and that it is not demonstrable as true, either by science or by Holy Scripture. This appears to be evident in several places in his book. He has made the subject, as he tells us, a matter of special study, and brings to support his opinion, an amount of erudition and research, that the writer does not at all assume to do, in reviewing his arguments. Nevertheless, I hope to shew grounds, in reason, and from Holy Scripture, to justify me in adhering to the doctrine so long held by the universal Church of God, in New Testament times.

It gives me great pleasure, to be able to give the following paragraph from Mr. White's book, with the expression of entire approval ; and it is upon this basis, as fortified both by *Natural Religion* ; so much, I see, disliked by the advocates of Conditional Immortality ; see "Tri. Part. Nature of Man," pp. 38 & 95;) and by God's Holy Word, that we build our belief of, a natural *unlimited existence* of the soul after death. I prefer this, to the term "immortality," as it more fully agrees with the evidence.

I have said that it gives me pleasure to quote the following passages from Mr. White's book; but I am in doubt whether they express his *own* sentiments, or whether they are a quotation from *another*, although *unacknowledged* as such: "Men in all ages, and in all lands, have looked with more or less confidence for a life to come. The tombs of the ancient Egyptians testify to the established belief in a future state of blessedness, or of misery. It was not simply a speculation

of the priesthood, but a fixed persuasion of the people. In every burial scroll, and every mummy-case, there is a picture of the balance of justice, in which the soul is weighed against the image of truth in the presence of Osiris, the lord of the under-world. The ancient literature of India and China, attest on every page the prevalence of similar faith in the soul's survival. In Greece, Socrates expressed in death, "the common hope of good men, that they had an inheritance beyond the present life. Before Germany was Christianized, the faith in the soul's immortality was widely diffused over barbaric Europe. In modern ages the irrepressible instinct of survival, practically triumphs, in every country over the opposition of scientific materialism. No stress of physiological evidence on the structure, and development of the brain, on the relation of the human brain to that of animals, on the dependence of thought on cerebral machinery, avails completely to silence the "oracle of God" within the heart, which tells us that "it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." He acknowledges that no valid argument can be *brought against* the above, "if taken for what it is worth;" but he says, survival does not necessarily carry with it, *eternal* survival. The soul *may* "change its form, and then die."

We do not enter into any such speculations. We go from the lesser light to the greater, and there seek solution of the problem. But we do not carry with us the inferences arising from the hypothesis of Evolution.

We will neither go *beyond* the evidence, nor *depreciate* it, but that evidence shall not be Science, but

Revelation. Moreover, we shall give "the upper room," not to Philosophy, but to Moral Intuitions; and in interpreting Holy Scripture, shall give them that place and precedence, which justly belongs to them, as "the voice of God within the heart." I have before quoted Mr. White's objection to the doctrine of man's natural immortality as injurious to the Creator, and making him to partake of a quality, claimed in Scripture for God alone.

Although this objection is not identical with that urged against man's natural immortality from Philosophy, it is *kindred* to it, and may here be refuted. God alone, it is true, has inherent, or *unimparted* immortality; but it may not necessarily derogate from God's honour, to suppose that He does *impart* it to His creatures. So in fact, Mr. White does suppose that He imparts it to *saved* souls, but to them only, and by faith in Christ. Why may it necessarily detract from God's glory, to suppose that the race were endowed with such a quality at creation; and that such a quality is not taken away by Adam's fall; any more than to suppose that God *gives* it to *some* at a later period, and by which gift they are elevated to the position which he considered injurious to the Deity to be possessed by a creature at a *period anterior*?

He will say, "Christ is magnified as the giver, and also, consequences are obviated which we consider injurious to the Deity, as inconsistent with His character." Still, the objection urged against natural immortality remains valid against Mr. White's Theology: as the *result is the same*, though at a later period.

We do not hold *inherent* immortality; but a *God given* immortality, at creation. Mr. White holds the same; but only to the elect, at the time of believing. Man is no more exalted in one case than the other; it is the *time* alone that enters into the consideration.

Moreover, our Lord asserts that the saints "cannot die any more," and so are equal to the Angels. We suppose that here our Lord refers to the Holy Angels. Yet, they may have been endowed at creation with Natural Immortality; and the question remains of them, as of man, was it *character*, or *nature of being*, that the fallen Angels lost by sin? We believe, the latter; and we are fortified in that belief, by the fact that man is by the Prophet David said to be made, (as lord of creation,) "a little lower than the Angels."

This, undoubtedly, must refer to his *nature* and *destiny, both*: and also it must include *the race*: man generally, considered as a class of God's creatures. It is equally evident that it is *first* intended of the race of mankind, and it only applies to the Messiah as one of that race; *a man* whom God has determined ultimately and fully to subject this world unto, as a reward for His vicarious obedience. So we understand, "All power is *GIVEN* to *me*, (Jesus of Nazareth,) in heaven and in earth."

Now, if this be true of man generally, that he was made, and is now, or was then regarded by David, as a *little* lower than the Angels, (for, were it not so, David would not so speak of a *glory departed*;) how does this apply to the doctrine under consideration: man's natural mortality, or immortality?

If man is naturally mortal, (as a sinner,) with respect both to his soul, and to his body, so that unless he believes in Christ, he will necessarily and naturally *perish for ever*, or cease to be; he surely must not only be, “*a little lower than the Angels*,” but *incomparably* below them, both with respect to his *ontological*, as as well as his moral nature.

It could not indeed apply to his *moral* quality or character, for as a *sinner* he must indeed be *very* far below the Holy Angels; it must therefore refer to his *ontological* qualities and characteristics, as an intelligent being. With respect to his *mind*: (although Evolutionists say that it is of the same nature as that of animals;) which in *its nature*, as also its combination with *moral faculties*, marks him, as like them, created for an *unlimited* or endless life.

He is, therefore, “*a little lower than the Angels*” in *this*; that his *capacity of knowledge*, and hence of the *enjoyment of God*, is less than theirs.

CHAP. III.

“Fall of Man and Terms of the Curse.”

I now proceed to consider the argument from Holy Scripture: from whence we derive our chief information concerning this and kindred subjects. It cannot, however, be said that we do so *unaided* by Natural Religion, or Natural Theology. If we have not philosophical demonstration of an endless life for the race, by consequence of our constitution at creation, by our Almighty Maker; we have at least, what is most weighty, a deep and intuitive moral persuasion, of a future life of rewards or punishments, according to deeds done in the body. So far for our positive evidence from Natural Religion. This tells us all, of a life, after death of the body. For solution of the problem as to the duration of that life, we may properly go to Holy Writ, as giving us fuller information. So also with respect to Natural Theology. Here, at least, we can discover nothing from the most careful study of the God of Nature, to demonstrate that those intuitions of our moral nature, which *beyond controversy*, distinguish us from that animal world of which he has constituted us masters; are denied to be true, by facts displayed to us therein: *i.e.*, by the works of God in Nature. Rather, from what we learn therein, although the amount of our positive knowledge may be meagre, we are ratified in our moral persuasion, that as there is a destiny for us different from that of the brute creation, because of our *moral faculties*; so there is

also a *radical* difference between our intelligence, or powers of knowledge, and that instinct which belongs to them.

So far then, from admitting that natural science gives any evidence contrary to the teaching of Orthodox Theology upon this subject ; we affirm that its testimony, as far as it goes, is decidedly in our favour ; and if from the source of knowledge of the mind and will of the Deity, which is confessedly inferior in *degree*, we can find such evidence ; we may confidently expect, that it shall not be ratified only, but *augmented* from that source of knowledge which is more full, and which is given to us for that express purpose.

We may here compare Mr. White's view, and that of Mr. Constable, as to the question of the mortality of Adam, as created.

Mr. White says : " We suppose, then, that from the simple account furnished in Genesis, we are to understand that Adam was not created in possession of immortality either in his soul or body ; yet also that he was not created under sentence of death, as was the rest of the creation around him [?], since the prospect of ' living for ever,' by the help of the tree of life, was open to him upon the condition of obedience during his trial ; in other words, the first man was not created immortal, but was placed in probation in order to become so." *Life in Christ*, p. 109.

Mr. Constable says : " Immortality *was* given to man at his creation. This priceless gift was one of the gifts which a bountiful Creator bestowed upon a favoured creature. *But it was alienable.* It might be

parted with ; it might be thrown away ; it might be lost. So He, the Law-giver, said when, in giving immortality, He also adds the warning, ' In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.' What is more, this immortality *was* alienated ; this priceless gift was lost. Man sinned, and lost his immortality." Nat. and Dur. of F. P., p. 21.

The argument of Mr. White appears to me to be open to more objection than that of Mr. Constable, in *these* respects : 1. That it favours the theory of Development, so that man is put absolutely, as to his *destiny*, because of his *nature*, in the same category as the brute creation, without a resurrection ; the more so, because that his immortality is supposed to be derived through a *material* cause. 2. Because by a literal interpretation of Gen. 2: 17, 19, it falsifies the Divine Word. Facts are *entirely* against Mr. White's literal interpretation : but *more* than this. Mr. Constable's theory is reconcilable with facts, just as he interprets what is meant by " Thou shalt surely die ;" that is, does the threat refer to the body, or to the soul of Adam ? But as he says that this refers to *literal* death, that is, death of the body of man, in a similar way to the death of that of the animals; *such* literal interpretation cannot agree with the fact of the narrative in Genesis 2 and 3. The threat to Adam was : " In *the day* that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Death is held by Mr. White and his friends, to mean the dissolution of life, both of soul and body : *destruction*. This, they say, was the nature of the penalty pronounced at the Fall. The language of the Creator,

however, couples time and character together : " In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shall surely die." If the literal interpretation is to hold, it must do so, not only as to the *character* of the penalty, but also as to the *time*. So, also, if the death spoken of was such a death as the animals suffer ; it must include the destruction of the soul as a living organism, at the same time as the *body* ceases to live. I see not how this can be avoided. Mr. White admits that the penalty *threatened* was indeed loss of life, at the time of transgression ; but that in consequence of the provision of Christ's Redemption, it was suspended, though not rescinded.

But what does this involve ? Nothing less than God falsifying *His own Word* ! Mutability in the *Immutable* !

We know that nought could change the word or purpose of the Most High, under a covenant which spoke not of mercy, but of justice. The difficulty is utterly insuperable, that God could nullify His own Word, when the command was absolute. Could such be the case, well might sinners promise to themselves that God does not mean *all* He says ! This is fatal to the whole theory.

The threatenings of God under a declared Gospel, and after the Fall, when there was a promise made of a Deliverer who should break the power which Satan had acquired by sin ; was with an ascertained and *declared* provision for pardon upon repentance. Without Repentance, looking to covenanted and promised mercy through a Deliverer, there could be no change

in Him, " with whom there is no variableness neither shadow of turning." To Adam, it spoke only as a ray of hope amidst darkness and sorrow ; but it was sufficient to tell of its *existence*. It is inconceivable that God had made *provision* to stultify His own Word, and while He threatened *Death*, He intended to give *Life*, which He had not promised under such conditions. The point at issue, here, is this : What is the *primary* meaning of *Death*, in the penalty declared against disobedience ? This being understood, it is also evident that the *whole passage* must be treated in accordance therewith. This does not exclude concomitant results ; these, however, are the *accidents*, rather than the *elements* of punishment. What, then, we will now ask, was the main feature of the punishment threatened ? In answering this, we have to consider man's relation as a moral agent to his Creator. This, evidently, must be a prime consideration ; and not his animal character as a corporeal being. This would give an entirely new aspect to the matter, to be considered hereafter.

This being premised, we may now compare the received and Orthodox interpretation, and consider what difficulties does this present when compared with the former. We hold that the *primary* meaning of death, as threatened to man as the lord of the visible world, although it included concomitant results ; had reference to a state of his moral nature, Objective and Subjective, in relation to his Creator, entirely different from the one he then occupied ; and so was fitly and powerfully described by the word *Death*. The threat-

was directed primarily against his spiritual nature—his *soul*. This, as the animating principle, is regarded as the man—Adam. So, also, we must give prominence to that act of the moral nature, in reference to a known command, of a Being also well known as to His character; and not to the physical effect, of the act of eating of a certain tree, upon his physical frame. So, we interpret death to mean, *primarily and chiefly*, a perverted and corrupted moral constitution in reference to his Creator—exactly parallel with what the New Testament describes as “dead in trespasses and sins”—or, being “without God in the World.” This, the great evil of the fall, was to take place *in the day* that he disobeyed; and it *did so*. God’s word was strictly verified. There is no difficulty here: God does not stultify Himself. So also remember, we are told that “by one man *sin* entered into the world, and *death* by *sin*.” He does not say, as well he might, if the gentlemen referred to, were correct; “death entered into the world;” but sin—the evil in its *spiritual* aspect; and in its effects upon a spiritual substance; and death, as it respects the body, following after as a concomitant result. Surely this is the most reasonable, and the *only* exegesis consistent with all the facts.

The *spiritual* evil, entailed by Adam’s transgression, and transmitted by him as an infection of their moral nature, to his posterity, is not only clearly separable from the *physical* evil which was only a concomitant result; but it must also take *precedence*, and be indeed *the evil* of the curse, as it was addressed to a being endowed with such moral faculties as man possesses.

So, the act and habit of sin against God, necessarily following from such an infection, as a quality and character, separates man from God. The spiritual evil, and the physical evil, are *conjoined* in the penalty as pronounced in Eden. Still, we hold that *the first* is the primary one, and that *chiefly* intended.

Also, it must be remembered that it is upon such a basis, that Scriptural Theology requires a regeneration of our nature. However it is taught, it rests upon *this* basis. Our Lord distinctly says, “*except a man* be born again, or from above, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven.” What part of his nature is so to be regenerated? Not his body, but his *soul*: Further, this regeneration is said to be a new creation: *καὶ νὴ κτίσις*. Now, to create, is to call into existence; therefore, the soul of man has, by the sin of Adam, inherited the curse from him, in this: *not* that it has become corruptible, or lost its existence as a spiritual entity; but that it has *lost the Divine image*, in the moral qualities not being agreeable to His will. So, only, in consistency with all the facts, can we interpret the threat as to be fulfilled “in the day” of transgression. So, also, is this agreeable to the account of the serpent’s temptation. In knowledge of the *actual* meaning, in its highest and primary character, he said, “Ye shall *not* surely die: your bodies will not perish. To *them* it may have meant, God will not do as He *threatens*; but the concealed *fact* was, God does not intend *this* by “death.” Here we may admit, not that Adam knew what death meant, by the knowledge of animal death, either as witness of the fact, or by “fossil evidences;” but by the

death of vegetable nature, or suspension of its energy. So, he may have had an *idea* of what was therein conveyed. It is not necessary, in order to justify to our sense of right, the action of the Creator and Judge of His creatures, in formulating such a threat, and also in executing it; to suppose that the *full meaning* of the penalty was understood by Adam. We have but to consider the condition of Adam as created: a sinless being, endued with a high degree of knowledge of God, and living in holy fellowship with Him. He was in a position to estimate duly the benefits enjoyed, and the obligation of obedience. I think we may say that it was no more necessary that a knowledge of the full extent of the punishment to be inflicted, should be conveyed to him; than it is necessary that parents should tell little children the *reason* for giving them a certain command, because they punish them for its infraction.

We may be justified in saying, that if a proximate knowledge was conveyed, of the consequences of disobedience—*this* were sufficient. We can BUT argue from *analogy*, here, of man's idea of the claims and obligations of right and wrong. It is true that such moral intuitions our Creator has *given* us; and therefore, as reflections of Himself, and His Law of procedure, they can form 'no *absolute* rule or criterion: much less a rule to judge *His* actions. We may say that it is still less admissible to argue from human jurisprudence, to that which is Divine; as the *latter* must be the criterion of the equity of the *former*; not *vice versa*. This remark, however, may be made; that even when a penalty is understood with clearness of its

theoretic meaning, it is not apprehended as to its *actual character* by the culprit, until he actually *bears* and *suffers* that penalty. Something similar it was, no doubt, in the case of Adam. It is a part of sin's character that it is *deceitful*, and as it enters, blinds the mind, as it corrupts the affections, and the will.

Lastly, I have to notice a very grave fact in connection with Mr. White's translation of Psalm 104. And here I am obliged to regard it as a wilful corruption of the original text, in order to support a *hypothesis*. He says that the Mosaic narrative of God's "*breathing* into man's nostrils the breath of life," no more favours his immortality, than that of the animals. In proof of this, he quotes Psalm 104: "Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, they are created; Thou takest away *Thy Spirit*, they die, and are turned again to their dust."

Now, such a rendering is utterly unjustifiable. The text is רוחם, "their breath," not רוחך, "*Thy* breath," or Spirit. But, here is both a false *exegesis* and a false translation. The scope of the Psalm tells us that David is speaking of God's all pervading Providence in the *care* of His Creation, and not of the *inceptive* act of its first production. Here David asserts, that the preservation and propagation of the various animals, is due to the direct interposition and agency of the Almighty: Biblical Theism, as opposed to Rationalistic, Pantheistic, Evolution in Nature. This is an important fact, and points to a great *error*, as the Psalm is quoted by Mr. White. His alteration of the inspired text, is a much more serious matter, as it is

utterly unjustifiable. I now refer to some passages of Holy Scripture, which we may fitly connect with the Mosaic narrative of the Fall, inasmuch as they are logically related thereto. It is from Gen. 2 : 17-19, that the definition of the *terms* in the argument is to be declared; and on that definition our *premiss* must be grounded. Mr. Minton says truly, "all admit that the words 'death' and 'life' are the crucial words of the whole controversy." The passages to be considered, are Acts 1 : 25, and Rev. 22: 11, 12. Other passages might be mentioned, but these are sufficient. Taken in connection with an intuition of man's moral nature, to the same effect; they tell us this at least, viz., that he is more than mortal. He is *not* one in character, or in destiny, with the brutes that perish. Here is positive evidence from Scripture, as there is from Nature, against the theory of Development; and negative argument, *at least*, in favour of natural immortality. This leads me to a brief consideration of the Psychological theories of the advocates of Conditional Immortality. Mr. White admits, that "the Geological record is in favour of the creation of groups by successive acts of the plastic power of nature, whatever that may be." (Pantheism). To the like effect, is the physiological evidence, which tells us of a clear distinction, between genus and genus in the animals. In fact, an impassable barrier between them: this Mr. White acknowledges. Page 30 and 31. Mr. Heard says, "the distinction between reason and instinct, was the starting point of the Cartesian philosophy. On the assumed validity of this distinction, modern psychology has

built its house, on what, we fear, must turn out to be a foundation of sand." Tri-partite Nature of man, p. 148. He abandons the distinction between the intelligence of animals, and the mind of man, as a ground of difference ; and supports his theory of the Tri-partite nature of man, by the assertion that the faculty of conscience, or God-consciousness, is the distinctive faculty ; and that man has body, soul and spirit. The difference of *intelligence* between man and the animals, he leaves us to infer, is but a difference in *degree*, not in *kind*. I am of opinion, however, that there is a difference, not *only* of degree, but *also* of *kind*. If the physiological evidence of a barrier between genus and genus, in the animals, is unimpaired, and this militates against the theory of development ; it is decidedly against the *inference* arising from that theory, of either a physical, or psychical identity of nature or being, or even a similarity. Mr. Heard says, that "man is the true monad" : and yet, this *God-consciousness* of which he speaks, *distinguishes* him from the animal race ; but if an absolute separation can be traced, between genus and genus in the animals, and there is indisputable argument for an essential difference between them and man, *because* of this *God-consciousness*, or conscience, be it *pneuma* or *psyche* ; what is there to forbid the belief, upon such evidence, that the difference between *man's intelligence* and the *instinct* of the brutes, is *just as absolute*, as the superiority of the moral faculty of conscience, is to animal intelligence, and by which it is distinguished from it ? The doctrine of a Tri-Partite Nature in man, is but a *theory* ;

and the affinities which it discloses, render it a very questionable one, for a Scriptural Theist to receive or endorse.

There is a real contradiction in Mr. White's 9th chap. book 2, of what he had previously admitted. It is essential to their purpose, to make out that there is an absolute fusion between the two (or three) parts of *man's* nature, so that, as the *animal* organism is broken up, or destroyed in death, it is likewise true of the *man*. There appears to be an equal inconsistency in the doctrine of Mr. Heard, as there is in that of Mr. White, with what I regard as Biblical teaching upon this subject.

Both are agreed as to the theory of a Tri-Partite nature in man; although they differ as to whether it is psyche, or pneuma, that is quickened in regeneration, and is the God-consciousness, or distinguishing faculty. That there *is* such a distinguishing faculty, seems to me a sufficient evidence, taken in conjunction with the teaching of Scripture; not only in favour of a *survival* of man, and so *against* the argument for his natural mortality; but also a *positive* evidence in favour of his *natural immortality*. I can but say, that I do not agree with Mr. White when he says, p. 42, "we hover in *doubt*, after all our pains, between two conclusions, and know not certainly whether our ancestry is from the perishable life of the globe, or *directly* from the hand of Heaven; whether our destiny is to return *wholly* to the dust, or to spend eternity with God.

Our nature bears traces of a *double* alliance, with earth and with heaven, and "we know not what we

shall be," till we enquire at the oracle of Him that made us.

Still less do I assent to the alternative which he proposes, "Either man is non-mortal because he is immortal;" or he is non-mortal because the hour is coming when all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live."—p. 90.

I do not agree with it, because it is an alternative which is based upon a false quotation. The passage is, not they shall "live," but they shall "come forth." The question is not of a resurrection, but of a *survival* of the *soul*, and that, whether by natural immortality, or by the impartation of the same by the act of Christ.

This *garbled* quotation, would tell also against such impartation of immortality by Christ; as they pro-ound it, since it is affirmed of "*all* that are in the graves." I know he does not intend this, but the alter-native which he so imposes, *requires* this interpretation.

The passage with which the *latter* part of Mr. White's quotation stands connected, is as follows:—"Verily, verily I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily I say unto you, the hour is coming and *now is*, when the *dead* shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and *they that hear shall live.*"—John 5: 24-25. I here quote from Van Oosterze on Luke : (p. 163:) "It is of course understood that the Saviour here by the first mentioned *νεκροί* means the spiritually dead, and it at once appears how much by the *double sense* in which the word "*νεκροί*" is

here used, the expression gains in beauty and in power. Here, also, in the use of language by the Synoptic, and the Johannean Christ, there is discernible an admirable agreement." Comp. John 5: 24-25.

I also quote from Stier on the above passage (vol. v. p. 107): "Yea verily, I am He whom you wait for, the Son of God, the raiser of the dead. Thus begins the Lord anew with His third Amen, Amen. But I have told you before, and now tell you again, that this quickening of the dead by the voice of my Word, begins now already in the souls of believers; and *that* is the true Resurrection of *life*, without which there can be none in any future time."

Also on Matt. 8: 22-23: (vol I. p. 358;) Who then are the *dead*? *Not those who are, being only mortals and soon to die, reckoned as being dead, for then the contrast here would be lost.* The disciple to whom it is forbidden is himself one of such. No, the Lord speaks here, as in St. John 5: 24-25, of spiritual death, according to the Spirit's usage throughout the whole New Testament. (I have italicized the second sentence.)

This quotation, singularly enough, directs us to the words, which Mr. Minton says, ("The Way Everlasting," p. 25,) are "the crucial words of the whole controversy." Who are "*the dead*" here spoken of? What the character of such death? The answer of a sound exegesis will not favour the theory of Conditional Immortality.

We may here make a few additional remarks respecting those passages before referred to: that is—Rev. 22: 11-12, and Acts 1: 25; as giving evidence to the fact that man is placed here *on trial for a future life.*

These passages also place the future life, both of the righteous and of the wicked, upon the same basis, *with respect to duration*. Of Judas it is said, "that he might go to his own place." In Rev. 22: 11-12, it is said that the *reward* of the righteous and the *punishment* of the wicked, consists in measure at least, in their *continuing* in the possession of a righteous and of a wicked *character*.

The obvious inference is, that such duration, as is there spoken of, is at least indefinite, as it is continuous. This agrees with a deep moral persuasion that judgment, or punishment, follows the mortal death of the wicked; and both go to fortify the conclusion, derived from the works and Word of God, in reference to the sin of our first parents; that the "death" spoken of, had reference primarily to their *moral nature*, and not to their *physical frame*. The animating principle, or moral nature, is in Scripture regarded as the man,—the *bias* of the governing faculty,—the *will*, whether it be for good or evil; is the *man himself*; but, taken in connection with the affections; which, again, govern the will, as the will does the *habit of the life*. That course of life, in relation to God and to Eternity, which, upon knowledge and trial, is *chosen and followed* here; has all the probability, derived from our intelligent moral persuasion, of being continuous and perpetuated:—and such conviction is ratified in the strongest way by the testimony of Inspiration. Moreover, take away this truth, and you take away one of the very strongest practical arguments to *deter* from wickedness and to *encourage* in a righteous course.

I will add, that we may here compare Rev. 22: 11-12, and St. Matt. 25: 46. The former teaches that the *natural* punishment of sin, is a *continuance of an evil character*.

The latter speaks of a *positive penal infliction* awarded by the Most High. This is described by *κόλασιν αἰώνιον*. That both speak of conscious suffering or *punishment*, and not privation of physical life, there can be no doubt. The former passage assures us of a continuance both of *life* and of *character*, in the case of the wicked. The *extent* of such continuance, as a fact of Biblical testimony, rests upon the meaning, in this place, of the word *αἰώνιος*. If, in such connection, that word may mean aught less than eternal, then may the punishment of the wicked *not* be eternal.

In concluding the consideration of this passage, as to the primary meaning of death, I will but add a few words, concerning the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and the tree of *life*. The two are connected with each other.

Mr. White seems to favour the idea that a medicinal virtue was attached to the tree of life, by which the decay of nature was continually repaired. This, of course, had reference *only* to the body. Therefore, as the one *poisoned* the system, so the other was of an opposite character; but both were *corporeal* in their effects.

This would give another aspect to the temptation altogether, inasmuch as it would give a *primary* consequence to the corporeal results, either for good or evil. We may rather suppose, that a test of obedience

in apparently so trivial a matter, was designedly given, in order to prove whether they would be absolutely obedient to, and trustful of, the Divine will.

Mr. White says, that the quality of the tree of life was such as to repair the decay of nature. The Mosaic narrative may, or may not, favour such a hypothesis; according to what is regarded as the radical idea of "life," or "death." If the perpetuation of animal life be regarded as the radical idea, and not the moral qualities of a responsible being in his relation to God; for from the words, "Thou shalt surely die," we must so regard either the one or the other; *then and only then*, may such a hypothesis be admissible. But there is another aspect of the matter. The Prophet Ezekiel and St. John, in the Apocalypse, both speak of the "tree of life." Such narrative is connected with the Millenial reign, or the final glory of the saints. Mr. White's hypothesis is, that Christ *gives* immortality to those who believe in Him. Their system of psychology (although there is a difference between Mr. White and his friends as to whether it is psyche or pneuma that is quickened in regeneration and so made immortal;) is, that immortality is obtained as a gift from Christ, to believers in Him, *while in this life*.

Now, this being the case, either such a state of immortality *is* so conveyed at such time by Christ, or it *is not*. If it *is* so conveyed, then what need afterwards to have access to the tree of life, to perpetuate an existence *already* immortal? If it *is not* so conveyed at such time, the effect of regeneration as stated by them is not correct, and they have to account for the

existence of the saints after death, as they do for that of the wicked; that is, that they do so by a special decree of God; the one to be first punished and then annihilated, and the other to be continued and kept in a condition of physical immortality by means of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God; and which St. John says, the saints alone have privilege of, as well as entrance into the New Jerusalem. If such be the case, their immortality comes to them, *not* as a gift of Christ, and a consequence of union with Him by Faith; but as a consequence of the medicinal benefits of a certain tree. Whatever relation the tree of life may have in that world, to believers, (but there is every reason to suppose it is only used by St. John in a figurative way to depict the happiness of the saints: *Canticles 2: 3-4,*) the whole tenor of Scripture, in this connection, is fatal to their theory of pyschology, and of the bestowment of immortality upon believers, *exclusively*, and through union with Christ by Faith.

I have said it is probable that St. John is making figurative use, of "the tree of life," to depict the happiness of the saints; but Mr. White can derive no advantage for his hypothesis from this consideration, until his interpretation of the death spoken of in Gen. 2: 17-19, is sustained by sufficient argument, both as to character and time. The literal interpretation, as we have seen, cannot hold as to *time*; neither can it hold as to *character*; for it is requisite that either a *literal*, or a *figurative* sense be given to the *whole passage*; and not that it refer literally to the body, and figuratively

to the soul; else they must confine their ideas of regeneration, to the giving of immortality, and not to the recovery of it in God's moral image. Thus, any inference from Ezekiel, or St. John, in their favour, must be a begging the question; as their *premiss is not granted*. If "death," and "life," have not the meanings their exegesis assigns them, no allegory can be based upon such meanings; but if the salient idea of "death," be want of conformity to God's moral image, and "life," be the converse of this; then the allegory is quite in keeping with our exegesis, and also with the entrance into the New Jerusalem, and presence of Christ.

It may yet be added, that the allegorical interpretation of the passage before referred to, there, as elsewhere, would do violence to their premiss, *the literal sense*: on this their hypothesis rests.

Mr. Heard (Tri. Part. Nat. of Man, p. 43) here differs from Mr. White, and has some very just remarks in relation to this subject. I quote but the following: "The spirit of man is not a mere act of creation, but rather an act of pro-creation. 'For we are also His offspring.' It is not, as in the Chaldean myth, that a drop of the Divine blood is mixed with the clay of the ground; but the breath of God breathes into man that rational and moral nature which makes us, in a sense, partakers of the very nature of God Himself."

CHAP. IV.

Life and Death, the “Crucial Words.”

As it is asserted by the advocates of Conditional Immortality, that the above words are the crucial words of the whole controversy, it is desirable to consider the meaning of them in other places of Holy Scripture, where they are used in connection with future punishment.

I shall first examine Mr. White's interpretation of passages selected by him as setting forth his views as to the meaning of life and death. In so doing, I shall confine myself to those words, and to the passages in which they are used. Their synonyms may be considered afterwards.

Matt. 6 : 25. Take no thought for your *life*.
(ψσυχὴ)

“Is not the life, (ψσυχὴ) more than meat ?” Why does Mr. White translate ψσυχὴ as *life* in one place, and in the other as *soul*? The reason, I think, is evident. He interprets the passage thus: “If you respect the Kingdom of God for meat and drink, you will lose your *lives*, body and soul.” This is a false exegesis, as the context shews. The whole scope goes to shew that the Saviour inculcates upon His disciples a peaceful *trust* in God for all *good* things; and by this consideration,—that He who gave the *greater* gift of *life*, will also give the *lesser* one of *food and raiment*.

Matt. 10: 28. “Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul.” The contrast here

is *first*, and chiefly between the *power of God* and the *power of man*; and only in a *secondary* way between the *body* and the *soul*. Further, it is noticeable that in speaking, in the last clause, of God's power, the verb *ἀπολέσαι* is used, which is less specific, and, is frequently used with reference to great evils, and does not always include death, or killing. (Matt. 18: 11; Luke 15: 6.) So also, although it may be affirmed of God that He is able to annihilate the soul, it by no means requires the *inference* that he will do so.

Matt. 16: 25. "Whosoever will save his life, shall lose it." And "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" Here Mr. White translates *ψυχὴ* by *life*. Compare this with his former translation in Matt. 6: 25.

Here he argues for a similar meaning of *ψυχὴ* in the first and last clause of Matt. 16: 25, and between the last clause of verse 25 and verse 26, because he says that it involves confusion in the sense—to translate it differently. But what of Mark 8: 20-22, "Let the dead bury their dead?" And His words to Martha, John 11: 25-26: "He that *believeth* in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth, and believeth in Me, shall never die?"

The passage under consideration is parallel. There is an antithesis between the bodily life, and the life of the soul, and also between the loss or losing of one, and between the loss or losing of the other. The same may be said of John 12: 15.

Luke 13: 1-5. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."

The similarity here is, not to be found in the word perish, but, in the *suddenness* and *irretrievableness* of the calamity in *both* cases.

Luke 20: 35. "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead"—"neither can they die any more." The resurrection is *here* only affirmed of the righteous. Why? Mr. White says, because the wicked are only raised to die the second death; but what is here pointed to? Is it not the *happiness* of the righteous?

For, it cannot be said that, to the *wicked*, a resurrection is desirable, or a blessing, but rather it is an aggravated *evil*.

John 8: 34, 36. "Whosoever committeth sin is the slave of sin, and the slave abideth not in the house for ever, but the Son abideth ever."

Here the leading idea is the relative position of a slave, and of a son in the house of God, or in God's presence, here or hereafter: *good enjoyed as from God*. The son has a property in the *love* of his father, and so a *fitting place* in his house. The slave has no legal nor moral *right* of a *similar kind*. The leading idea is not existence, or non-existence, but love and happiness, or otherwise.

John 8: 51. "If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death."

Mr. White says, that the literal interpretation of the Pharisees was confirmed by our Lord's subsequent affirmation of His own pre-existence. The Pharisees, however, understood it of the body also. Mr. White does not, of course, but of subsequent Conditional

Immortality. This is not a literal but a *figurative* interpretation. Our interpretation is equally legitimate, and is sustained by the analogy of Scripture teaching.

Moreover, the verb *θεωρέω*, has here the Hebraistic sense of to *suffer*, as it is followed by *θάνατον*, so that it here asserts, fully, the peculiar privilege of the righteous, to whom even *mortal death* is disarmed of its sting. “Death is yours.” We are delivered from the *fear* of Death.

John 10: 10, 27. “The thief cometh not,” &c. The action of the *thief* is to *damage* and to *distress*; that of Jesus, the benefactor, is to *confer* good, not to *take good away*. Not merely to give *existence*, even *perpetual existence*; this is not the main idea, if it has any place here. The contrast is between *good* and *evil*, *happiness* and *distress*. The verb *ἀπολέσῃ*, (from *ἀπόλλυμι*), means, here, to *damage* or cause *loss*, not to *annihilate*.

John 11: 49, 50. It is expedient for us that one man die, (*ἀπόθανῃ*), and that the whole nation perish not, (*ἀπόληται*). Here, too, the comparison is not between the *extinction* of the one man and the *extinction* of the nation, but between the *suffering* of one man and the *suffering* of the whole nation, *as a nation*.

Acts 3: 22, 23. “It shall come to pass that whosoever will not hear the voice of that Prophet shall be destroyed from among the people.” The reference here is, to civil penalty inflicted upon those who broke the constituted law of the Supreme Governor—like as was Moses. Under the Old Testament economy, those who despised his law “perished without mercy.” The New Testa-

ment speaks about a much sorer punishment for those who break the law of Christ. The *salient* feature, is the *irretrievable* character of future punishment, whether under the Old Testament or under the New Testament, as it here applies to *presumptuous* sinners, and especially against the Gospel.

Acts 8: 20. "Thy money perish with thee, or, with thee to destruction," (*εἰς ἀπολείαν*.) I suppose that money can scarcely be *annihilated*, although it may be made *unproductive of good* to its possessor. So St. James says, "Your gold and silver is *cankered*." You hoard it up, and it does neither you nor others any good. The money of wicked rich men, as *their cherished good*, can never in the future world, though they had it, *at all mitigate their wretchedness*.

Rom. 1: 32. "Who knowing the judgment of God, that they that do such things are worthy of death," &c.

Mr. White says, that the heathen knew they must die, and he leaves us to infer, contrary to facts, and to his own testimony that they had no idea of resurrection, or of *suffering in a future world*. The latter they *certainly* had.

The appeal is not to knowledge of *physical facts*, but to the *moral intuition* which God gave to the heathen of a future judgment.

Rom. 2: 6, 7. "To those who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honour and immortality, eternal life;" "but to those who are contentious," &c. Here, "eternal life" is contrasted with "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish;" not with *extinction*.

In Rom. 6: 23. "Death" is contrasted with "eternal

life." The one we hold to mean *misery*, the other, *happiness*.

Rom. 8: 13. "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die, (ye are about to die), but if ye, through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."

The necessity of mortifying the deeds of the body through the indwelling and operation of the Holy Spirit, is here urged upon believers as conducive to the prosperity of their new life, and thus the terms "death" and "life," have here that tropical sense which they often bear in Holy Scripture.

1 Pet. 2: 11, is a parallel passage:—"Dearly beloved I beseech you, as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul."

So also, 1 Tim. 6: 10, "The love of money is the root of all evil, which, while some coveted after, they have erred from faith and pierced themselves through with many sorrows."

Gal. 6: 8, "He that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption."

Mr. White admits that *φθορὰν* means *moral corruption*, as well as *physical*, but says it cannot mean the former here; but I ask why not? Certainly it is true that to follow "the devices and desires of our own hearts" will result in reaping the fruits of a corrupt *character*, because sowing to a corrupt *nature*. This character is its own *punishment*, as the sowing to the Spirit is, in a spiritual character, its own *reward*, expressed by "life."

Heb. 10: 26, 31.—There judgment and fiery indignation are said to *eat up* the adversary, and a much

sorer punishment than death, is threatened to those who disobey the Gospel.

The punishment spoken of was for *presumptuous* sinners, for whom there was no atonement under the Law. Presumptuous sinners, under the Gospel, have a much sorer punishment, not in *duration*, but in *degree*, as it is against *degree of light and mercy*. So chap. 2: 2, 3, is parallel, and says that there is *no escape* for such sinners, but a certain and fearful doom ; that is all we are specially directed to in both passages.

2 Pet. 2: 12, "These as natural brute beasts," &c. Here Mr. White makes much of the idea of the slaughter of *beasts* ; and as they perish and go to nothing, so of wicked men. Here we see that he does indeed carry with him the *inferences* arising from evolution, although he admits it, as a theory, to be untenable. But let us look at page 10, where St. Peter speaks of such hardened sinners living sensually, and so corrupting their character, or confirming themselves in a corrupt character by immoral practices. The two, perhaps, are parallel ; and as the corruption is tropical, so is the punishment described in a similar way :—Remediless punishment described by death. As notorious offenders against the public weal are, by God's law, condemned to suffer capital punishment ; so, irreclaimable sinners are to be "cut off," or "cast out" of God's presence "into outer darkness," as not fit for His Kingdom.

1 John 2: 17, "The world passeth away, and the lust thereof, but," &c.

The contrast here is, not between *extinction* and *life*, but, between a perishing *universe*, and also the *dying*

out of the fires of the lust of this world—and the perpetuity of a blessed character, and the satisfaction that it gives to its possessor.

Rev. 3: 5, speaks of “not blotting out the name” of the overcoming Christian from the book of life.

Mr. White concludes it must mean, by inference, that sinners now living, or then living, will be “blotted out” in the sense of *ceasing to be*.

This, however, is hypothetical altogether, as it may certainly refer to privation of certain *blessings* connected with those so entered in such a book. Also, we must connect the *book* of life with the *water* of life and the *tree* of life, and I have before shewed that the language there is metaphorical, and has, most probably, reference to the *happiness* of the godly, and not primarily to their *existence*.

Rev. 21: 8. The portion of liars is the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone: “the second death.”

Mr. White argues that it must be like the first, or it could not with propriety be termed the *second*. This, however, does but beg the question, because the meaning of death, as descriptive of the nature of future punishment is the very matter under discussion.

The notion of extinction, after mortal death, arises from unsupported premiss. Death of the *body* is the end of *good* to the body, so this *second* death may be the absolute end of all *possibility* of *good* to the *soul*, and not the *extinction* of the soul.

It now remains to notice some passages in which certain expressions are regarded by Mr. White as synonymous with death. Matt. 3: 12, and 1 Cor. 3: 14.

In both these passages, the severe and destructive character of fire is used to signify the *irretrievable* character of God's judgment in the future. In the latter, however, the reference is to the destruction, not of persons, but of *works*, which makes it altogether inapposite to the question.

Luke 20:18. "On whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder."

Mr. White takes this to mean, he shall be annihilated, or suffer extinction of being. Such an idea, however, is less worthy of consideration when the text is viewed by itself, than that of *remediless* punishment. When taken in connection with the general teaching of Scripture as to future punishment, it is utterly untenable. I will add that a prime fallacy underlies all Mr. White's exegesis of Scripture upon this topic, in that he requires a full description of the nature of future punishment in every quotation.

The nature of the subject is such, that we may justly expect to find it described from different points of view; and so indeed it is in most of the places where spoken of in Holy Scripture. I may now proceed from the Negative to the Positive, and give my exegesis of the meaning of the terms Life and Death.

The words, of course, are to be regarded in the connection in which they are found, and with relation
1. To matter, 2. To mind.

Mr. White admits that they are tropically used, and that they have sometimes a moral signification.
P. 403.

In considering the Biblical meaning of these

words, as applied to man, in distinction from the animal race, the question naturally and necessarily arises, what is the first or leading idea attached to them ? Is it first and chiefly, *existence*, as in the case of irrational creatures ; or is it with reference to *good* and *evil* ? To man's relation to the Deity, and to his moral qualities, and to the consequences arising therefrom ?

In fact, is existence a necessary good ? or is it so, only mediately and instrumentally ? As it applies to Future Happiness, does its first principle consist in an *ontological* quality, or in a *moral* quality ?

I hold that the words Life and Death, as applied to future rewards and punishments, are synonymous of pain and joy, and that such is the normal meaning of these words in relation to man as a moral agent and responsible being. 2 Cor. 4: 11, and Psalm 23, may here be quoted in evidence. It is, of course, a well known fact to every Hebrew scholar, that, בְּקָרְבָּהּ צְלָמָה, does not mean *literally*, “the valley of the shadow of death,” but great trouble or sorrows ; being parallel here with Psalm 43: 2. and with Psalm 130., where, מַעַמְקִים, “depths,” or “deep places,” are symbolical of *distress*. Mr. White (p. 400) does not fairly represent the orthodox view, when he says that we, in the use of these words, “elude the idea which they most properly denote.”

Not only is it necessary to recognize which is the first or leading idea, in the use of these words, in *such relation* ; but, also, we must give to such words, *either*

a *literal*, or *figurative* meaning, as used in particular passages. They cannot have both a *literal*, and a *figurative* meaning, in the same passage: *i. e.*, they must refer to the body, or to the soul particularly. Further, we have not only these important general principles, as the basis of our argument; but we have a particular evidence in confirmation thereof. *Acts 5: 20*, “Go, stand and speak in the Temple to the people all the words of *this* life.”

This evidently includes two things. *First*—That as the life of the Christian, so described, includes a present and continuous condition in another world, so also this is contra-distinguished from life of *another kind*. It is clearly against materialism, and by just inference, also adverse to conditional immortality, as propounded by Mr. White. *Secondly*—It evidently makes the present and future condition of the righteous, to be distinguished by the *character* of the life spoken of, and *not* by its *perpetuity* merely. It is not only “words of life,” present and future, but also of “*this* life.”

Mr. White, while he professes to admit that the words have a *tropical* meaning in some cases; *First*—seeks to blend the *literal* and the *figurative* in the *same passage*. *Second*—While admitting the *figurative* sense, neutralizes it, by saying that it is used “*proleptically*” of death; not in a spiritual, but in a corporeal sense. *Third*—He applies the *forensic* sense of the term, to passages where the *subjective* and *spiritual*, and *not* the *objective* and *forensic* sense, obtains. *Fourth*—His argument as to $\alpha\pi\kappa\tau\epsilon\iota\omega$ and $\alpha\pi\theta\eta\sigma\kappa\omega$, being

convertible terms, is illegitimate ; as the sense of each of these words must be determined by the connection in which it is found. In the passages, Rom. 7: 11, and 2 Cor. 3: 6, Man's impotence by the Law, and his strength by the Gospel, are declared. So St. Paul says, "When we were yet without *strength*," &c. His attempt to fasten an absurd meaning upon Eph. 2: 1, by the tropical or spiritual sense, which we there attach to it is, in like manner, a sophistical procedure.

The Apostle in using *ἀποκτέινω* in Rom. 7: 11, did so to express a *transition* from one state to another ; viz., from a sense of *security* and confidence of strength, to a sense of weakness and *insecurity*. In Eph. 2: 1, he contemplates the state of spiritual death, *as a state*, without its *realization*, or the *capability* of its realization by those who are the subjects of it. In Rom. 7: 11, he describes an experimental *acquaintance* with it, by reason of a passage *out of* it—from the one state to the other.

The following definition covers the whole ground as to the Biblical meaning of Life and Death, as applied to man.

I. A *literal* and objective signification. (a) Present. (b) Future. These senses have reference to man's corporal life, or what he has in common with irrational creatures, and include the idea of sentient enjoyment, or suffering.

II. These words are descriptive of the condition of the animating spirit and reasonable soul, in relation to God, who made and gave it.

This includes the idea (a) of the moral and subjective

character of the soul as in affinity either with God or with sin ; (b) the description of its legal or forensic state before God ; (c) the description of a happy or unhappy condition, by reason of that relation, moral and legal, towards God, that it so occupies : 1. In the present ; 2. In prospect of the eternal future.

This I believe covers the whole ground, and is supported by the facts of science, and by the facts of Scripture teaching.

Mr. White *takes it for granted* that life always includes happiness ; and death, misery. Obviously, and practically, a most *false* assumption. The love of life is explained by the natural desire for happiness. Life is but a *means* to that end, yet means and end are often identified because of such association ; so also in the *use* of language. Some texts may here be given in illustration : Job 7: 7, "O remember that my life is wind ; mine eye shall no more *see good*." 1 Peter 3: 10, 11, "He that will love life and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips, that they speak no guile." Psalm 27: 13, "I had fainted unless I had believed to *see the goodness* of the Lord in the land of the living." Eccles. 11: 7, 8, "Truly light is *sweet*, and a *pleasant* thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun ; but if a man live many days and *rejoice in them all*; yet let him remember the days of darkness, for they shall be many." Thus far, of our natural life, as distinguished from spiritual, or that which appertains distinctively to man's moral nature. Of the *latter*, our Lord says, "A man's *life* consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth."

St. Paul : "The kingdom of God is *not* meat and drink, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." So 1 Thes. 3: 8, "Now we *live* if ye stand fast in the Lord." 2 Cor. 4: 12, "*Death* worketh in us, but *life* in you." So Psalm 16: 11, as quoted by St. Peter, Acts 2: 28, "Thou hast made known to me the ways of life: Thou shalt make me full of joy with Thy countenance."

Mr. White thinks that perpetuity of existence is *first*, if not all. We think that the *primary* and *chief* sense is, of *good* and *evil*.

Concerning the manna it was, briefly, as follows : Not living for a *little while*, or living *forever*; but the *truth* taught by the manna, as realized only in *Him*. *Corporeal* bread is from Heaven; much more that which is to *bless* and *cheer* and *satisfy* the *soul*. So of the well of water and the Samaritan woman. It was a question of temporary, or eternal *refreshment* and *enjoyment*. Also, *corporeal* enjoyment, contrasted with *spiritual* enjoyment.

On page 253, Mr. White explains forensic justification to be, not legal acquittal from guilt, and imputation of righteousness ; but, the being "saved alive."

It may now be added that while "life," and "death," as applied to future punishment, describe the *natural* reward, and the *natural* punishment hereafter to be enjoyed or suffered ; so, from the *connection* between Natural and Positive rewards and punishments, those words do frequently *comprehend both* ; and also, sometimes, describe the Positive side of such rewards and punishments.

In view of what has been advanced, it may now be

confidently said that, as the *ἀρχὴ* of life is the *good* enjoyable therefrom; so, whether as descriptive of natural and corporeal, or of moral and spiritual *good*, the terms life and death may be regarded as literally descriptive of an actual fact. “In God we live and move and have our being.” So of natural or bodily life and good. The death of the soul, is the result of its moral affinity to God being taken away by sin. This is its own punishment, and may be justly considered to be the *prime* part of its punishment; although it be the *natural* punishment of sin, as chosen and followed in *preference* to God. The Positive punishment awarded of God hereafter; whatever it be, may well be regarded as a subordinate, inferior and concomitant result, fitting to such a character.

It is even more palpably evident as true, concerning the death of the body. Thus, it is evident that the words Life and Death are justly applicable, upon grounds of reason and of fitness, to the *two* parts of man’s nature, as literally descriptive in their several places of actual *good* or actual *evil*, to the body, or to the soul of man; of that enjoyment which he has in common with animal nature; or of that which he is, as a *moral agent*, peculiarly capable. If it is true of the former aspect of its nature, it is no less true of the latter. If we start from the premisses of a sound Theism, that “There is one living and true God Everlasting, without body, parts, or passions, of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things, whether visible or invisible;” and that man as the product of this all perfect intelligence, was created by Him with mental

and moral faculties dependent upon *Him* for satisfaction and happiness, as the lower or animal part of his nature is dependent upon His all-sustaining care for continued existence, and created good. Further, when we consider the division that confessedly and indisputably, (unless by Materialists), exists between man and the brutes, by reason of this God-consciousness, or moral quality with which he is endowed; and also as we trace a similar distinction between the animal nature of man, and his spiritual nature; the operations of the soul as the animating principle, in relation to the body which it animates, and its operation with respect to extraneous entities, and especially with reference to God, and truths relating to *Him*; so, we may properly consider that the words Life and Death, in view of the *premisses* asserted and established by the Divine writers, are also *used* by them, in a sense corresponding to the *nature* of the soul, as well as of that Being to whom it stands so naturally and nearly related, not merely for *existence*, but also for *happiness*.

CHAP. V.

The Death of Christ, as related to the Death the Curse of Sin.

It remains now to consider the teaching of Mr. White upon this subject, and although it involves one of the doctrinal issues arising out of "this theodicy," as it is so connected with the meaning of the terms *Life* and *Death* as used in Holy Scripture in relation to Future Punishment; I have thought it well to consider the subject in this place. The difficulty which the old divines have felt as to the nature of our Saviour's expiatory sufferings, or rather their relation to the curse denounced upon Adam's sin, is met by Mr. White in a very unique, if not in a very scriptural way. The great Doctor John Owen, considered that the sufferings of Christ were identical in their *nature* with those due to sin under the Law, but not as to their *extent*; the dignity of His Person entering into the consideration in the award of Divine Justice. (Vol. 10., p. 448.) Baxter, in his aphorisms on Justification (p. 23) is quoted by Mr. White, as declaring his belief that Christ suffered "a pain and misery of the same sort and of equal weight with that threatened to Adam." The point of difference between these two great divines appears to be this; Baxter considered that there was no commutation, because he imagined that the sufferings of Eternity were comprehended in the Death of Christ. How this could be, I see not.

Owen's idea that the *pains* of Hell constituted the *essence* of His death, while eternity and the attendant circumstances were but the *accidents*; the dignity of His Person being accepted, as an equivalent for such "accidents," seems *more* comprehensible. There is, however, I conceive, a difficulty which we cannot elucidate.* Mr. White cuts the knot of the difficulty with his philosophy, and tells us that "it was a blow falling on the Godhead itself." How Deity itself could suffer; (remember it is not the *human nature* in the Divine Person;) how, I say, the *Deity* itself could suffer, and at the same time *inflict* that suffering, *I* cannot understand, neither with respect to the essence of the Deity, nor with respect to his Tri-une Personality. Such teaching is utterly destructive of Scriptural Theism. We cannot well here eliminate the doctrine of the nature of God, or of the Saviour, from the specific doctrine under consideration; but I only notice the fact that as Mr. White repudiates the doctrine of a vicarious atonement, the innocent Jesus willingly suffering for guilty man, so, he says that the Divine Attributes are here not in harmony, but in conflict. (p. 264-275.)

"However startling the statement, the finite will erring and rebelling is represented as setting in eternal opposition to each other the attributes of God, &c., &c." Yet with strange inconsistency he say also (p. 261), that "the man Christ Jesus endured the curse;" but he tells us that his *human nature died*, and the *Godhead*

*See note on this subject in Appendix.

suffered. "The whole Godhead sacrifices itself in the agonies of a human death, that man though a sinner may live for ever." (p. 281.) He quotes Hooker as saying (but *where* he does not tell us) that "man hath sinned and God hath suffered." So far, I have yet to learn that the "judicious Hooker" has supported so heterodox and unscriptural a statement. I quote the following, as affording the fullest evidence of Mr. White's meaning concerning Christ's suffering, and that said suffering he supposes was in His *Divine*, as distinguished from His *human* nature.

"It does not, however, appear to be anywhere stated that the indwelling of the Divinity changed the character of the curse of the Law, in the case of our Lord, from everlasting misery into literal death. It will, therefore, be sufficient to receive the simpler representation that, the 'man Christ Jesus' endured the curse. If it be asserted that it was the presence of the Godhead within, which dispensed with the infliction of endless pains through the substitution of an Infinite Majesty for the infinitely extended misery of a finite being, we reply that, on the same principle, the Divine nature of Jesus might have imparted an infinite value to any one of the stripes which He bore, &c., &c."

"We *thus* derive support to our argument that the *death* threatened to Adam was literal dissolution."

"The fact that Christ bore *this* death, laid down His life as a man, shed his *blood* for our redemption, without suffering in hell beyond, is proof that *death* in the Bible signifies literal death, and that *life* signifies literal life. (p. 261.) I do not deal here with the character of the *argument*.

He says : (p. 276,) " There is but one way then, say these God-taught men, that sinners, death doomed may obtain life eternal. No innocent creature must suffer, however willing. *God himself must suffer*, in one exceptional sacrifice, if sinners are to be saved."

" *It is not a blow falling on an innocent creature outside the Godhead. It is a blow falling from the sinful creature on the Godhead itself.*" (The italics are his.)

With relation to the death of Christ as our substitute, and so bearing for us the curse of sin, I have to remark in the first place, that there can be no analogy between His Person and *ours*. Secondly, that the suffering preceding the death of the body—the dissolution of the connection between body and soul—can form no fit analogy to what Scripture speaks of, as the " death " of the soul : Of the former we have *some* knowledge ; but of the latter we have *none*. Thus Mr. White's application of the *abstract* doctrine concerning " death " as it applies to man, in the Bible ; and " death " as related to the death of Christ, and endeavouring to demonstrate the *latter* to be expletive of the *former*, is utterly without logical force. More than this. If Mr. White cannot substantiate his premisses as to the literal meaning of death, viewed in the *abstract*, as I think I have conclusively shown ; it is yet more emphatically denied, in the *concrete* matter here dealt with, from the simple fact of the character of His Person, who is the God-man.

I may also add, that the argument of Dr. Angus in this connection, is still unrefuted, and Mr. White has

yet to escape from the dilemma which he says (p. 121) that he has "unlocked." Dr. Angus is but arguing respecting the *abstract* idea of "life" and "death," and pointing to the fact that Mr. White and his friends, hold destruction in connection with a long period of *suffering*. He says: "Either these ages of suffering are the destruction, or they are not. If they are, then clearly destruction is consistent with continued life. If they are not the destruction, but precede it, then the destruction is not inflicted when Christ comes, as it is said to be, and the threatened destruction, which is always spoken of as a punishment is a blessing and not a curse. It is either suffering, or a most welcome release. From one or other of these conclusions we see no escape." (Dr. Angus on Future Punishment, p. 25.) Dr. Angus's argument turns upon the radical idea of life and death, and is parallel with my own. Mr. White's application of the *abstract* doctrine to the death of *Christ* is at least *illogical*; it may truly, also, be said to be *irreverent*.

The analogy between bodily death, and future punishment, is actually begging the question, being the very point at issue. Neither can it be urged that as future Punishment is spoken of as the "Second Death," it must therefore be similar in *character*; because it depends upon the *nature of the idea associated* with the fact, as it applies to a *moral agent*, as well as to the fact *itself*. We say that mortal death is an evil, as it cuts off all *possibility* of temporal enjoyment; so that negatively it is an evil as related to corporal enjoyment. The same is the radical idea contained in the moral aspect of the

same term as it applies to man's *moral* relation to the Deity: by sin he is cut off from God, and so from *happiness*. The great *distinction*, from *our* point of view, between the first or present death of the body, and the future punishment of the wicked, described as the "second death," lies in *this*; that it is both Negative, or Natural, and Positive, or Penal Suffering. Also, that the latter relates to *corporeal* and present, as distinguished from *spiritual* and future good.

The term Death, as descriptive of Future Punishment, does not *fully describe* all that punishment. I consider that the *natural* punishment of sin, may well be looked upon as its most severe punishment, whether in this world or the world to come, and it consists in its own *necessary* character, and its natural and necessary results, in respect to moral relation to the Deity. So of holiness, its *chief reward* is of a similar kind. Place and circumstance are but the *accidents*, not the *elements*. So, I consider that in the *original curse*, this was the *cardinal* idea. The natural punishment, expressed by "death," *includes* the Positive and Penal aspect of Future Punishment. Judas's character was his chief punishment, but it entailed *also* his going to "his own place."

CHAP. VI.

Usus Loquendi of the Sacred Writers and the Hebraism of the New Testament.

I think that the way is now sufficiently prepared for the consideration of this very important subject. It might be sufficient to ascertain the *fact* that words were used by writers of this or that period or nation in such a *sense*, in order to base an argument for their interpretation by us, in relation to subjects treated of in the sacred volume ;—and there is no doubt that there is perfect unity, and continuity of idea, in the language used by believers upon “one living and true God,” and the great and supreme fact of relationship to Him, *here* and *hereafter* ;—but, if we can give reason, not scientific or philosophical, (for this we do not aim at, nor consider essential) but *rational*, in view of the facts revealed by *inspiration*, for such a sense being attached to certain words in view of God-given and revealed evidence, concerning Him as our Creator, and ourselves as His creatures ; we have, I conceive, something further to consolidate our argument from the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers.

This is the more necessary, because our *Premiss* must be taken from a period when we may say that the *usus loquendi*, as a fact in evidence, cannot avail for determination of the sense. But, having given sufficient evidence to support our rendering of the meaning of the words Life and Death, as connected with the Fall

of Man ; the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers must be very important, as *corroborative* evidence.

I cannot but consider that all the arguments adduced by Mr. White and others to support their interpretation, are entirely *hypothetical*, and not supported by sound logic, the logic of *facts*: whether viewed from the standpoint of Natural Theology, or of Revealed Religion.

Mr. White puts forth a certain remark of Hooker (valuable in its place and measure, but not as an *absolute* rule,) as a cogent argument for the literal interpretation of the language of Scripture as to the nature of future punishment; but surely he does not contend that there is *no* figurative sense to be attached here, or elsewhere, to the language of Scripture! And if *not*, his argument as to the literal sense, is a mere *petitio-principii*. Hooker's rule, "that when a literal sense will stand, the furthest from the literal is *commonly* the worst," is relatively true; but over-against that, we may put the following canon laid down by Horne. First, however, I will remark that, how the words of the curse may have a literal rendering, I have already shewn; and, I believe, from manifestly sound premisses. Horne says : Introd. Part 2, Book 1, sect. 2-4: "Ascertain the *usus loquendi*, or notion affixed to a word by the persons in general, by whom the language is now, or was formerly, spoken, and especially in the connection in which such notion is affixed." And again, sect. 2-4, "Although the *force* of particular words can only be derived from etymology, yet too much confidence must not be placed in that frequently uncertain science, "because the primary signification of a word is frequently very different

from its common meaning." I do not hold that there is any *contradiction*, in the use of the word "death" by the sacred writers, from the beginning to the end of Revelation; but that a duplex reference is found in the words of the curse, each bearing a sense corresponding to the *nature*, and to the *good*, both of the *body* and of the *soul*. There can be *no good* to the body when the animating principle is withdrawn from it; *no good* to the soul when it *loses its moral affinity to God*. "Woe unto them also when *I* depart from them." Having established this truth as the simplest exhibition of a subjective Theism, I proceed to enquire "What is the relation of the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers thereunto."

Does the scope of their testimony *ratify* this fact, *as a fact?*

Mr. White and Mr. Constable, most vehemently inveigh against those who would give to Greek words any other sense than that which they bore to *Greeks*, and than that in which they were used by them. The Greeks were Polytheists, and their language, as to its use by *them*, was guided by that fact. The Jews and the Apostles were *not* so, and consequently their *character* stamped their use of the language, and so it was moulded to their wants, not *they to it*. So it was not alone their *nationality*, but their *view of the Deity*, that in its relation to *this* fact, modified or changed its meaning as it was used by *them*. The Hebraistic character of the Greek New Testament is a fact so well known, that it may well be wondered how such an argument can be brought forward by scholars, as practically ignores this fact.

It is indisputable that such a difference does exist, and that not only in idiom, but of a more radical character, so as actually to change the former meaning of words and divert them to new uses and significations. A great work by a German scholar, classifies the Hebraisms of the New Testament, and enumerates no less than 31 classes; while of words under "Class 1. New significations, *i. e.*, words of pure Greek origin, but taken in a sense unknown in Classical Greek," he enumerates no less than 47.

Yet Mr. White and Mr. Constable, with others, are indignant that any other than the Classical use should be acknowledged in Scripture interpretation!

I will but give a few words, as instances of such marked difference, or superaddition of senses nowhere else obtaining, in connection with said words.

Of the latter we may take *εἰδέναι*, to see, and *γινώσκειν*, to know; as used in 1 Thes. 6: 12, and 1 Cor. 16: 18, To "care for," "kindly regard;" and, applied to God, to "acknowledge," "adore."

So also *δοπτέσθαι ζωὴν*, and *θάνατον θεώρεῖν* and *ἰδεῖν*: viz., To "see death," for "to die," and to "see life," for "to live." The superadded idea, here, is that of suffering, or that of enjoyment, as connected with life and death.

It is also an established fact that the words, "death" and "life," *θάνατος* and *ζωὴ* do, in the sense in which they are used by the Inspired Writers, include the ideas of happiness and misery, as well as those of existence, and cessation of life.

Of the former, *i. e.*, words used in a completely different sense in the New Testament, to that which

belongs to them in classical writers, the following may be mentioned : 'Ειρήνη, peace, for "happiness" in general; *σπλαγχνα*, heart, mind, for "pity," "compassion;" δίκαιος, just, for "pious," "good;" so *σαρξ*, flesh, for the "natural man;" and *πνεῦμα*, spirit, for the renewed or "spiritual man;" *i. e.*, partaker of the Holy Spirit. So also, ὀφεῖλημα, debt, for "sin;" ὀφειλέτης, debtor, for "sinner;" *σπέρμα*, seed, grain, for "offspring," "descendants;" *μισεῖν*, to hate, for "to love less;" *περιπατεῖν*, to walk, for "to live." Many others might be given, but these, as instances, are sufficient.

These facts are indeed evident to the readers of our translation: and to those familiar with the language of Scripture, and particularly to possessors of experimental acquaintance with Divine Truth; it will need no argument that the phraseology of Scripture has a meaning peculiarly *its own*. The basis of this meaning is the objective truth of the Divine existence; the statements of Scripture concerning His character, and concerning *sin*; and also, the actual relation of the believer to God.

Notably it is evident, that the degree of experimental knowledge of God derived from Nature, must be less marked than that possessed from Revelation. But the issue before us, is *wider* than this. Allowing the writers of the sacred volume to be *godly* and *renewed* men; as Theists in the proper sense of the word, there must be present, in the character of their writings as they deal with man's relation to God; all that difference from classical Greek, which exists between Theism and Polytheism.

CHAP. VII.

Figurative Description of Future Punishment.

Under this head, I shall first consider several expressions found in Holy Scripture, which are much relied upon by Mr. White, in his plea for the hypothesis of conditional immortality. The measure of information that the Most High has seen fit to give to us, is limited in extent; and mostly, in the description given to us, drawn from facts with which we are, more or less, familiar.

Such expressions, as "to consume," "to devour," "to destroy," "to root out," "to kill," "to perish," "outer darkness," "blackness of darkness," "silent in darkness," and some others of similar import, are to be looked upon, not as *complete*, still less, as literal descriptions of the destiny of the wicked. Such language is frequently used with respect to temporal judgments inflicted by the Almighty upon wicked men, and so from the relation of a known unhappiness, to an unhappiness that is beyond the reach of human knowledge and experience, yet both inflicted by the *same* sovereign hand; the one that *is* known, is used by Him to delineate that which is unknown. Most of the quotations made by Mr. White from the Psalms, and elsewhere, refer to *temporal* inflictions; but when similar language is used in the New Testament, it is, when applied to future punishment, but as relatively descriptive thereof; as, in the Prophetic Scriptures, a *local* judgment is often used by

the Holy Ghost, to represent or partially describe the universal judgment and calamity spoken of as "the Lord's controversy," "the day of the Lord," or His judgment of the Nations when He will gather them to battle in the Valley of Megiddo. So, the destruction, of Jerusalem was used by our Lord to *intimate*, rather than to describe the judgment connected with His last advent. So of Isaiah 33: 14, referred to by Mr. Constable: "Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire?" He endeavours to show that Poole contradicts himself when he refers this, both to a destruction by the Assyrians in this life, and *also* to a punishment inflicted by the Most High in another world. But nothing is more common in the Prophetic Scriptures: even as the treachery of Ahithophel, and that of Judas, is described in the same passage of the Psalms. (Ps. 41: 9.) The *more remote* sense is the more weighty matter and meaning of the prophecy. This consideration, too, will be of the greatest weight and importance when we consider that description which our Blessed Lord has seen fit to adopt, as a delineation of future punishment. Tophet and the Valley of the Son of Hinnom, not only was regarded by the Jews as emblematical of the place of punishment in another world, but was so used by the Prophets. Thus, "Tophet is ordained of old. For the *King*, it is prepared: He hath made it deep and large: the pile thereof is fire and much wood; the breath of the Lord as a stream of brimstone doth kindle it." (Is. 30: 33.) Bishop Lowth says: "It is therefore used for a place of punishment by fire; and by our Blessed Saviour in the Gospel, for

hell-fire, as the Jews themselves had applied it." Scott says: "It is also said expressly to be prepared for the King; yet Sennacherib was not slain with his army, although his power and glory then vanished. The certainty and dreadfulness of the destruction, rather than the place of it, seem intended. The large and deep valley, prepared long before for the purpose, supplied with a vast pile of wood and other combustibles, and kindled by the breath of God, as by a stream of burning sulphur, when the blaspheming monarch and his most formidable army were brought down into it, forms an awful emblem of the 'everlasting fire' prepared for the Devil and his angels, and for all the enemies of God and the triumph of Christ over his party, the King and his subjects."* With this passage may be conjoined ch. 33: 14, before referred to. Bishop Lowth says, that the Chaldee Paraphrast, in this place, *i.e.*, ch. 30:33; renders שָׁלֵם מַזְקִין—by "the gehenna of everlasting fire:" and of both these passages, it is undoubtedly true, that under the image of a local and terrible judgment in *time*, the Holy Ghost does also prefigure, and points to a yet more awful judgment, and one that is to be *general*, in a future world. The fact that both future happiness and future misery are so *prefigured*, is by Mr. White and his friends utterly ignored. In their special pleading for their favourite theory, they would deprive us of the most precious and important truths given to us in

* While the above is the near meaning, there is, no doubt, a more remote and more weighty reference. "The King" referred to in the passage, is Jehovah Jesus: to Him, as King of Kings, is given all power for future judgment, and punishment of His enemies.

the prophecies of Holy Scripture, as they also violate the received Canons for their *interpretation*. In the same manner, also, might they wipe out all those prophecies of the Saviour's advent which are the great hope of the Church, since they are usually given to us under similar figures.

Isaiah ch. 66: 24, is another instance of figurative description of everlasting and future punishment. Mr. White, in referring to the received interpretation of the language here used, styles it the "venerable fable" of the fire and the worm. In this chapter, as in others, the Holy Spirit appears to pass from the local and particular judgment upon the ungodly nation referred to, to that great and general judgment which, as it were, swallows up *all* others. I cannot forbear here, from quoting Lowth's note upon this place, in full: "These words of the Prophet are applied by our blessed Saviour (St. Mark 9: 44) to express the everlasting punishment of the wicked in Gehenna, or in Hell. Gehenna, or the Valley of Hinnom, was very near to Jerusalem, to the S. E.: it was the place where the idolatrous Jews celebrated that horrible rite of making their children pass through the fire—that is of burning them in sacrifice—to Molech.

"To put a stop to this abominable practice, Josiah defiled, or desecrated, the place, by filling it with human bones (2 Kings, 23: 10, 14); and it was the custom afterwards to throw out the carcases of animals there, and it became the common burying place for the poorer people of Jerusalem."

Our Saviour expresses the state of the blessed by

sensible images; such as Paradise, Abraham's bosom, or, which is the same thing, a place to recline next to Abraham at table in the Kingdom of Heaven (St. Matt. 8: 11)—for we could not possibly have any conception of it, but by analogy from worldly objects. In like manner he expresses the place of torment, under the image of Gehenna, and the punishment of the wicked, by the worm which there preyed on the carcases, and the fire which there consumed the wretched victims:—marking, however, in the strongest manner, the difference between Gehenna and the invisible place of torment; namely, that in the former the suffering is transient—the worm itself that preys on the body, dies; and the fire, which totally consumes it, is soon extinguished—whereas in the figurative Gehenna, the instrument of punishment shall be everlasting, and the suffering without end; for there “the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” These emblematical images, expressing heaven and hell, were in use among the Jews before our Saviour's time, and in using them He complied with their notion. “Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the Kingdom of God,” says the Jews to our Saviour, St. Luke 14: 15. And in regard to Gehenna, the Chaldee paraphrast, as I observed before in chap. 30: 33, renders everlasting or continued burnings, by the Gehenna of everlasting fire. And before his time, the Son of Sirach (7: 17) had said “the vengeance of the ungodly is fire and worms.” So likewise the author of the Book of Judith: “Woe to the nations rising up against my kindred; the Lord Almighty will take vengeance of them on the Day of

Judgment in putting fire and worms in their flesh," ch. 16 : 17 ; manifestly referring to the same emblem. The point that I *specially* wish to controvert is this: namely, that the punishment of the future is *fully contained* in the language used, and that it *ends* there: That it is *literally* descriptive, instead of *symbolical* thereof. The one would make it a *physical*, though a dreadful *death*; the other, a *spiritual punishment*. It involves, also, *more* than this; for when our Saviour's language concerning it—*thrice repeated*—is considered, it acquires additional force—and when He says "it dies *not*: it is *not* quenched;"—the language is *ominous* and *awful* beyond degree. It remains to consider one more metaphorical description of future punishment contained in the history of the Old Testament. St. Jude refers to Sodom and Gomorrah, and St. Peter couples with the overthrow of the cities of the plain, the flood in the days of Noah. Mr. White and Mr. Constable, in reference to this, say that the destruction was completed when the two cities were burnt. So of Idumea, spoken of in Isaiah (ch. 34), the smoke "does *not* go up for ever and ever;" in other words they interpret it *literally*. But St. Peter and St. Jude both cite the two great judgments of the old world, as warnings, or "examples to them that after would live ungodly." They were mere *intimations* of a future judgment; not *full descriptions* of it, however *awful*. They were intended to give evidence to the *fact*; not fully to *describe all that fact*.

With regard to the passages in the Book of St. John's Revelation, which they say form our chief argument

for the Catholic doctrine of future punishment, as to its character and continuance; I will *here* make little argument from them. I am ready to allow that much of the language used in the Apocalypse is to be understood *tropically*; but not *all*. The “fire” and the “lake” *may* be so understood; but when “torment” is spoken of, and when it is said, “they have no rest, day nor night,” and for “ages of ages,” the meaning cannot be tropical.

In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, if our Lord’s language was tropical in its character, it was descriptive of an *actual fact*. If it had reference to the intermediate state of the soul, it clearly spoke of *sensible punishment*. More than this, there is no intimation, not even the most remote, of a future *deliverance*. In fact quite the opposite, and the hope of *reformation* or *redemption* not only appears to be confined by the language of our Saviour to *this* life; but also to those means of grace, by His Revealed Word, which he has *here* and *now* given to us.

CHAP. VIII.

Literal Terms.

Having considered the figurative and allegorical descriptions of Future Punishment, I now come to the consideration of those terms used in Holy Scripture, as *literally* describing the same.

These are comparatively few, but I think they are quite unmistakable, both with respect to the fact and character of *punishment*, and also with respect to its *continuance*. A few words first, with reference to the former. As the New Testament plainly speaks of *punishment*, Mr. White and his friends are necessitated to describe this term. They do so, by declaring that as it is synonymous with "death," so, it covers no more than is contained in cessation of life, or, in other words, animal death:—*destruction*, as they define it.

This, they say, is punishment, because continued life is *necessarily* a good. It requires little consideration to dispel this fallacy. Let us remember that *persistently wicked characters* are the subjects of this punishment; and then ask the question whether continued or eternal existence, in such a character, would, under any circumstances, be to them a *good*; and whether annihilation of *such* beings, would be *to them* a punishment?

Evidently, the *summum bonum* of "life," as it is regarded subjectively and inherently, must be character.

True is the adage, "Virtue is its own reward"; true, also, that vice is its own punishment. Objectively considered, God Himself, in His favour and love, is the *summum bonum* of "life"; but this the wicked cannot enjoy because of their *character*. His *creatures* also, they will be deprived of hereafter. How then can the *annihilation* of such beings, be literally and properly a *punishment*? Literally, however, rationally, and properly, it must be so, if Mr. White's theory is to stand. We understand "punishment" *literally* to mean punishment, because we have no authority whatever, either from the etymology of the word itself, or from the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers, to give it any other meaning. Neither can we, from rational or philosophical considerations, do so. Moreover, we understand it to comprehend a positive and punitive infliction, awarded of God, outside of, and super-added to, the natural result of an evil character. "Death," we hold, properly and naturally, to describe the latter, although sometimes associated with the former in Holy Scripture; but while the Old Testament commonly defines Future Punishment by words connected with "death" and natural life; the terms used by our Saviour, are more specific and with reference to a positive, punitive, and awful infliction.

Their own rule, the literal sense, here condemns and confounds the theory of Mr. White and his friends. Thus far with respect to "punishment." The literal sense of this term is intensified, by our Saviour's associating with it the word "fire," not (as Mr. White says) to utterly destroy or obliterate the wretched

subjects of punishment, for the context *forbids* it; but literally to *punish* them. It is immaterial whether we understand the "fire" to be literal fire or not; our Lord uses "everlasting fire" and "everlasting punishment" as convertible terms, and terms synonymous with each other in this connection.

The idea of "punishment," however, forbids entirely the idea of consumption or destruction. Did we need anything further to explain this matter, the language of St. John in the Apocalypse is conclusive. He speaks of "torment," *βασανισμὸς*: and this torment is not alone the portion of the devils, but of wicked men. (Ch. 21: 8; St. Matt. 25: 41.) Moreover, it is said that the adherents of Antichrist "have no rest day nor night," "they shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation; and shall be *tormmented* with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb." (Ch. 14: 10.) No plea can possibly do away with the obvious meaning of the obscurity and figurative character of this Book, such language. The one word, *βασανισμὸς*, is quite sufficient to banish such folly. However awful it may be, as believers in Divine Revelation, it becomes us to bow to the evidence of the Divine will.

It remains now to consider the duration of such "punishment," as described by certain terms in the New Testament.

Dr. Littledale, in his recent comment upon Dr. Farrar's volume, speaks of *αἰώνιος* as the "crucial word;" and while he admits that it often, unquestionably, has

the meaning of *endless*, yet says that other Greek words *undoubtedly* meaning “eternal” or “endless,” *might* have been used by the Apostles, and no doubt *would* have been used, had such a meaning been intended. He does not, however, notice the fact that the Hebrew word בָּאֵדֶת, having a precisely similar meaning, viz., that of obscurity, or indefiniteness, is generally used in the Old Testament, not only to describe “eternity” in the proper and metaphysical sense of that word; but it is also used in reference to Jehovah Himself. Thus we arrive at a satisfactory solution of this question. The word *aiώνιος* was used by the Hebrew writers of the Greek New Testament, because it followed the analogy of the Hebrew Scriptures; and if בָּאֵדֶת was sufficient to describe the character of God, it was also sufficient and fitting to describe “eternity” in the proper sense of that word. But the idea conveyed in *aiώνιος* is intensified by the word *aiώνιας τῶν αἰώνων*; this is used in Rev. 20: 10, when speaking of the punishment of the Devil. With such punishment the language of our Saviour, as also that of St. John in the Apocalypse, connects that of the wicked men of this world, as well as the angels connected with Satan in his rebellion; and if the language used in such places requires any further explanation, as the punishment of the one is identified with that of the other, both as to the *time* of sentence and the *place* of such punishment; any place of Holy Scripture describing the punishment of the devils, will likewise describe the punishment of wicked men.

This argument, which I have applied in my review of Mr. Oxenham's pamphlet, I will again adduce here. The Apostle Peter, in his Second Epistle, speaks of the punishment of devils: so also Jude in his General Epistle. St. Jude speaks of "everlasting chains," where the word *ἀἰδοῖος* is used, which, without any doubt whatever, means "everlasting" in the strictest sense of that word. Here then we have what Dr. Littledale conceives to be *wanting*. The only possibility of escape from this conclusion lies in the idea that the *future* judgment of the Great Day may be *retrogressive* in its character with relation to the devils; that whereas their chains of darkness, or bonds of misery, are *now* eternal; at that period, because *αιώνιος* is sometimes used to express a limited though indefinite period, *therefore* it may be so in the case before us. Dr. Littledale, however, rejects this possibility, as he says, that such supposed retrograde action of the Deity, as *reversing* the process of creation, is the *chief* objection to annihilation.

Comment is unnecessary. I shall only add a few words as to the grammatical construction in St. Jude 6. Mr. Oxenham would have *εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλες ἡμέρας* to mean, *until* the judgment of the Great Day; but the construction will not stand. Winer, in his Grammar of the New Testament dialect, (§ 53, c), says, "εἰς, transferred to *internal* relations, (or in a *tropical* sense), is used of every object, *aim*, (a) of the measure (Bernhardy, p. 218) to which something rises, 2 Cor. 19: 13, *εἰς τα ἀμετρα* 4: 17, (b) of the *state* into which something passes, Acts 2: 20; Heb. 6: 6, ("renew

them again *unto* repentance,) (c) of the *result* : Rom. 10: 10, (with the heart man believeth *unto* righteousness.") The two last clauses in brackets are my own, and given to suggest a parallel.

Thus, if we regard the natural consequences of *sin*, we may interpret this as referring to the *result* of their sin, and if we regard the punitive *purpose* of the Most High, we shall connect it with the *aim* of their being so bound. "The Lord hath made all things for Himself, yea even the wicked for the day of evil." Prov. 16: 4.

Viewing this subject from the only legitimate standpoint, the teaching of the Holy Scripture, that teaching is, I conceive, quite clear and explicit. It is simply a matter of Scripture evidence, which fairly and candidly taken, can point to but one conclusion. The literal descriptions of Future Punishment afforded us in the Holy Scriptures—literal because they cannot be *otherwise* interpreted ; are descriptive of punishment, properly so-called, and not of annihilation, nor do they afford, as does not the whole tenor of Scripture afford ground for the assumption, that such punishment is described by the analogy of the death throes of this mortal and corruptible body. It is not a *compound* of destruction and punishment : Holy Scripture nowhere so describes it. It is not destruction or annihilation, as, I think, I have proved ; but the just exegesis of Holy Scripture goes to shew that it is *punishment* ; and so far as we can see, or have any positive Revelation from the Deity with regard to the measure of its continuance ; and I think it is equally clear that we *have* such positive evidence ; that punishment has no end.

It remains to be noticed, that Mr. Jukes, Mr. Cox, and Canon Farrar, as well as the advocates of Conditional Immortality, make much of the supposed exaggerations of our translators, because they have very frequently translated $\ddot{\alpha}\delta\eta\varsigma$ and $\gamma\acute{e}\acute{e}\nu\alpha$ as synonymous terms, $\kappa\acute{r}\acute{e}\sigma\varsigma$ as damnation, and $ai\acute{w}\acute{v}\iota\varsigma$ as everlasting.

I think, that to any candid and intelligent person, and to any Theologian that is not, as such, incapable of admitting the force and value of evidence; the æonial theory has been sufficiently disposed of; not only in view of the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament, but also of that of the Old Testament writers, whether of the Hebrew and inspired text, or of the Septuagint translation; and also from the use of the Talmudic and Classical writers. See Appendix (a). I shall therefore do no more here, than briefly consider Mr. Cox's very indignant language concerning the use made by our translators of the other words referred to. That $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{v}\mathfrak{v}$ and $\ddot{\alpha}\delta\eta\varsigma$ are identical in their general meaning, is, I believe, admitted by all. That $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{v}\mathfrak{v}$ does sometimes mean the grave is true; but certainly not always. Prov. 23: 14, and Isa. 28: 15, 18, are places, where the grave, most certainly, cannot be intended; and it is very questionable, whether they refer to the intermediate condition of departed sinners. In like manner the synonomous use of $\ddot{\alpha}\delta\eta\varsigma$ and $\gamma\acute{e}\acute{e}\nu\alpha$ is not without justification. In the parable of Dives and Lazarus, it is in $\ddot{\alpha}\delta\eta\varsigma$ or the intermediate state, that he (Dives) is described as being in torments. ($\beta\alpha\sigma\acute{a}\nu\iota\varsigma$.) Although the sacred writers certainly give us to understand that

such inflictions upon the wicked, are not that ultimate and final infliction subsequently awarded at the Last Day ; yet does both the Old and New Testament, give us to understand, that such inflictions are reserved for the wicked hereafter : the Old Testament,—*generally*, by the word נַשְׁׁפֵּךְ ; the New Testament more *particularly*,—sometimes by ἀδόντς, sometimes by γεέννα. This is the case with the literal terms describing such punishment, albeit that both Tophet and Ge-Hinnom, were used as *figures* thereof. Now, considering that the object and duty of translators is, to give the *sense* of the original, to the great body of readers ; what have Mr. Cox and his friends to complain of the action of our translators, save that facts of scripture, do not agree with their favourite hypothesis ? Did they not hold a theory of probation in Hades, they would have no object to serve, and no ground for objection.

With regard to the word *κρίσις*, no doubt that a milder term than the word “damnation” would often agree better with the context, since the weighty signification attached to it, in the present day, makes the word, in such cases, to exaggerate the meaning conveyed in the original, and so intended, we may say, by the inspired writers ; but may not such defect of our present translation, in some cases, in this connection, be accounted for by those constant changes in the use and value of terms, which in every age are taking place. In all cases the *weight* of the word must be determined by the context : this is the case with the original, why not with the translation ? This, however, is quite a different thing from saying that the *lowest* etymological

rendering, is *always* to be taken. Yet this is the special pleading of, and this the foundation for the indignation with which those who have a theory of universal salvation, or of materialism, attack the fidelity, (or shall we say the ability ?) of the translators of our authorized version. This, I think, may be quite sufficient; if it be but noticed, lastly, that such words as *περισσότερον κρίμα*, (Matt. 23: 14,) and, (in that awful denunciation contained in verse 33 of the same chapter) *κρίσεως τῆς γεέννης*, do by no means relieve the word *κρίσις*, from the weighty and awful signification, which the moral sense of mankind, and present usage, attaches to the English word—"damnation."

CHAP. IX.

Of Probation in Hades.

Restorationists, and the majority of those holding Conditional Immortality, hold that there is probation in Hades; it is therefore fitting that we consider upon what grounds. It must be acknowledged by themselves that it is upon very uncertain and limited evidence. Mr. Oxenham would appear to cherish such a hope in connection with 1 Cor. xv., which speaks of Christ's universal conquest and the destruction of

“death.” This subject is, however, entirely without the range of revealed truth, as a part of the economy of redemption, and with that alone we have to do. It forms one of “the secret things which belong unto the Lord our God.” We have no authority in a matter of fundamental truth, where one of the “elements” (*στοιχεῖα*) enumerated by the Apostle, Heb. v., 12, are mentioned, to hazard even a “probable conjecture,” much less a mere chimerical notion, directly contrary to all the positive teaching of Christ Himself.

What shall take place after Satan’s rebellion shall have been put down, and the saints’ deliverance from sin made complete, we are not told. The 15th ch. 1 Cor., deals with the resurrection and state of the righteous, and not with that of the wicked; therefore any inference concerning them is utterly groundless.

Yet, the plausible plea put forth on the grounds of reason, apart from Scripture, that if the wicked perish for ever, and are not “restored,” Satan is made the richer, and not Christ, is common to the advocates of Restoration and of Destruction. Mr. Oxenham, Mr. Constable, Mr. White, and Dr. Littledale all are in favour of it; so also Mr. Heard, (Tripart. Nat. of Man, p. 283). They associate the continued existence of evil with the Manichaeon heresy, and would appear by their judgment to “shut up” the Deity to final salvation not only of men, but (by inference) of the devils also. It is sufficient to notice the fact, not requisite to argue against it, since our only argument is from God’s revealed will. Sound Theism will conclude that God the Lord will take every care of His honor. Restora-

tion, however, is but another name for Universal Salvation after certain degrees of punishment.

Thus the Divine goodness (according to man's conception of it) is made to appear in the absolute *cure* of evil in all men, at the last; and what is peculiar to the saints, is, according to this theology, made ultimately to be the portion of *all*. Universalism, however, is based upon the immortality of the soul, so evil is to be cured. Destructionism is based upon man's natural mortality, therefore evil must finally be destroyed and perish with evil men, and devils also, since it is assumed that they too are mortal. None are immortal save He who possesses inherent immortality, and the saints to whom He gives it, (when we can scarcely conclude from Mr. White's teaching), and also the holy angels. Why these should have immortality given to them exclusively; at what time; and upon what authority it is held, we are not told: here, however, the two systems diverge. Both hold to probation, in the sense of *purification*, in Hades. Universalists, that the wicked will be "tried," or *purified*, and after this saved at last; Destructionists, that the wicked will be further "tried," more particularly those who died under imperfect knowledge, and another offer of salvation made to them, and also (as Mr. Heard holds), the *righteous*, specially those who are imperfectly sanctified; they will be further "tried" in the sense of being further sanctified and made holy: not however by purgatorial fires, but by other influences whereby the *excito motor* part of their nature will be made more subservient to a sanctified will. Thus he utilizes the theory of the Trichotomy.

I do not here follow Mr. White in his reasons for receiving as true, the survival of souls in Hades. Suffice it to say that he does so receive it, and herein he separates himself from the general and consistent theories of Materialists. Here Mr. Constable (p. 315) is consistent, Mr. White inconsistent. Mr. White agrees that the antediluvians, and the uninstructed generally in gospel truth, will be evangelized in Hades. So, such consideration may ease their concern, who receive it, respecting the nations who have not yet heard the gospel.

Having noticed these various man-made theories for the moral government of mankind, it will be most profitable now to turn to the enquiry, as to what is the doctrine of Holy Scripture, concerning the intermediate state between death and the general judgment, when and where such a probation is supposed to take place. The Orthodox Catholic Church has long held that there is such a state after death—an intermediate state—so called because the soul, separated from the body, has not yet reached the climax of its happiness or of its woe. Believers in such a state are happy. They are said to be “with Christ,” to be “in Abraham’s bosom,” to be “with the Lord.” So also in the parable of Lazarus and Dives, the latter is said to be “in Hell,” and also “in torments.” Here it will be well to consider what this parable—if indeed we may not say history—teaches as to Probation. It is given by the Saviour and Judge of men. It is weighty truth as it comes from Him. Not only is the rich sinner said to be “in torment,” *punishment*, but it is highly

significant that as he himself had no hope of deliverance therefrom, so also the Lord (awful thought) gave him none. Not the faintest intimation here of a proffered Saviour, or of Fatherly chastisement; but there is the assertion of the existence of a "great gulf," between saints and sinners. Further, there is a distinct reference to a *past choice*, a chosen good, for so we must understand, "thy good things," or else we must conclude that all who are rich and prosperous here, will suffer hereafter, and that all who suffer here, will be happy there. So much then for the prospect of Probation in Hades, given to us in this part of Holy Scripture.

We will now turn to 1 St. Pet. 3: 18-20, one of two famous passages which are thought clearly to teach this doctrine; and upon the second, 1 St. Pet. 4: 6, which is similar, although more obscure, Mr. Heard quotes Lange, and notices the approval of Dean Alford. "Holy Scripture nowhere asserts the eternal condemnation of those who have died either as heathen, or as not having heard the gospel. It rather implies, in many passages, that repentance is possible, even beyond the grave, and distinctly declares that the final decision is made, not at the moment of death, but at the last day." Acts 17: 31, 2 Tim. 1: 11-18, 1 St. John, 4: 17 are quoted, but I see nothing, there or elsewhere, to support such an assertion, and I do not hesitate to declare my unqualified dissent from such a proposition, notwithstanding the great names of those who maintain it. With regard to the exegesis of these passages, as the second is the most obscure,

and both are with relation to the same subject, I shall first examine 1 St. Pet. 3 : 18-20. Mr. Heard notices that various interpretations have been given, of both passages. It is not necessary to examine them all, but only as they stand related to the idea of probation of the *impenitent*. Archbishop Leighton refers the passage in ch. 3, to Noah's preaching by the Holy Spirit. Bishop Horsley, Bengel, Luther, and others, refer it to those who repented upon Noah's preaching, but who, although they were not saved in the ark, were yet subjects of grace, and to them, as to the large multitude of those who had perished under circumstances of doubt, our Lord delivered, or *mention* is made of his delivering to *them*, the tidings of his grace. The former refers to the Spirit's action by Noah, and does but indirectly refer to our Saviour, not with regard to his Messianic life, but with regard to His Divine Personality. When we consider the fact which Bishop Pearson has pointed out, we may well be surprised at the conflicting opinions of really great and good men upon this subject. That most sound Theologian has remarked that Christ's descent into Hades as held in the creed, and as it formed part of the Catholic faith, was in His human soul, in accomplishment of a part of the Covenant of Redemption, in this respect, that He might undergo the condition of a dead man, as well as that of a living one. But it was as a *righteous* man that He did so ; as a perfectly holy man ; so as the grave could not retain His body, neither could Hades retain His soul. It is manifest that the "Spirit" referred to in St. Pet. 3, must mean the Holy Spirit,

since St. Peter affirms by the same He was “quickened.” Hence it is, I think, apparent, as Bishop Pearson says (art. 2, p. 170): that this passage does not treat of the descent of Christ in His human soul into hell; and if it is held by any that He descended as to His *Deity* peculiarly, it must be something extraneous, and in addition, to the creed of the Catholic Church, and not as a part of the Covenant of Redemption, since, not the work of His human nature, not sustained by the general tenor of Holy Writ, nor by the doctrine of the Catholic and Primitive Church. As Bishop Pearson shows (art. 5, p. 36), the early Fathers used this argument against Apollinaris, (who held that Christ had no intellectual *soul*, but His Divinity was to Him in place thereof,) that it was in His *human nature* that He descended into hell. As to the *purpose* or end of His descent, there was no strictly Catholic doctrine held in the primitive Church. The various *conjectures* framed by individuals, without authority of Holy Scripture, were fruitful of evil, then, as they are now. It is, I think, apparent that this text does not teach that Christ preached in person, either to the righteous, or to the wicked dead, in Hades. It remains but to notice ch. 4: 6, which I interpret, with Archbishop Leighton, as referring to the *believing* dead, who, although they appear to the eye of carnal men to be in no better a condition than others, inasmuch as they suffer the same universal penalty, of natural death, and connected with this, also the cardinal idea of earthly *sorrow*; yet are they approved of God, and as such

their souls live and are happy before Him. I have paraphrased it thus, and in so doing, express not only my own view, but also that of the great and good Archbishop referred to. This rendering, too, is quite in keeping with the context. These are the only two passages of Holy Writ, having any real semblance of favouring the idea of probation after death, or of Christ's preaching either to the righteous or to the wicked, after His suffering and death upon the cross. It may here be added that our Lord, in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, denies the *utility* of any one from the dead preaching to men living here upon earth; and of the converse, (*i. e.* of the living Christ preaching to men departed,) the objection that this would make God's dealings in the course of creation to be retrogressive, (which is contrary to all known facts) is both pertinent and valid. Thus, I consider that enough evidence has been brought to show that Holy Scripture does not countenance the theory of a probation in Hades. The doctrinal issue arising out of such a theory I shall discuss hereafter.

COLLATERAL ISSUES

Involved in Mr. White's Teachings, as to Conditional Immortality.

(A.)—NATURE OF GOD.

Having now, as I consider, fully and sufficiently met, examined, and confuted the direct arguments of Mr. White and his friends as to the doctrine of Holy Scripture concerning Future Punishment; I now proceed to consider those doctrinal issues which he has raised in the assertion of the theory of Conditional Immortality.

They are of great moment, and such as to affect the very foundations of Biblical religion. They afford a proof that there is an indestructible unity between the great fundamental principles of the Bible, and its practical teaching.

The first matter I shall notice is, that the character of the ever blessed Jehovah is affected by the teaching of Mr. White. As the conception we have of the nature of God must be the corner-stone of our Theological system, so the same truth, as it is really received into the heart, must regulate and mould the quality of our religion. Thus it is a first requisite, as it is a necessary effect of faith in God, and a biblical knowledge of Him, that we regard Him as, although far beyond our full comprehension, yet, entirely worthy of all our trust, and all our love.

All the teaching of Holy Scripture goes to enforce

this. So also, all the disciplinary and experimental knowledge which His grace conveys to us, personally and individually. A few passages may here be given : “Canst thou by searching find out God ? Canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection ? It is higher than Heaven, what canst thou do ? deeper than Hell, what canst thou know ?” (Job 11: 8.) Though “Clouds and darkness are round about Him (yet) righteousness and judgment are the habitation of His seat.” (Ps. 97 : 2.) “Although thou sayest thou shalt not see Him, yet judgment is before Him, therefore trust thou in Him.” (Job 35 : 14).

Job exemplified this : “Although He slay me, *yet* will I trust in Him.” So, as God teaches by His Word that we are to “wait” for Him; in like manner does He teach us by His grace : and both assure us that it shall not be in vain. Mr. White’s theology, however, changes all this. It weighs God in man’s balances. It compares the Almighty to ourselves, and what it cannot *so* fathom or interpret, it rejects with philosophic scorn. It is rationalistic in its character. It rejects the Scripture statements of the nature of Deity. It scouts the idea of a *passionless* God.

Thus (p. 277) : “How uninteresting a process the worship of such a God must be ; of One to whom *you* bring thought, anxiety, emotion, passion, praise, affection, gratitude, prayer, heart-sacrifice, and who in return looks upon you with a calm eternal gaze of impassive omniscience, without the faintest approach to fatherly love.” So he *caricatures* the descriptions given to us of the Eternal and Unchangeable one. Of Him who

is so distinguished from us that He is *not* "of like passions as we are."

Holy Scripture nowhere says that God is *impassive* in *this* sense: *i. e.*, that He does not recognize good or bad, right or wrong, and also all the qualities, wants and feelings of His creatures: that He does not distinguish between them duly, and perfectly appreciate them all, and provide accordingly for those who look to Him and seek Him; but it denies to Him the imperfection of change.

A man changes his *mood*, from anger to pleasure, from dissatisfaction to content, from selfishness to benevolence; so *he* is imperfect, but God changes *not*. Hence our great ground of confidence in Him, who is always the *same*, while, "with a perfect man, He will be perfect, but with the foward He will shew Himself unsavory," and *so* reward every man according to *his* works."

All this results from the refusal to recognize the *incomprehensibility* of God,—*i. e.*, that He is in any *full degree* comprehensible. So does Mr. White (p. 280).

His "Excursus on the sensibility of God," is all illustrative of the same principle. But if Mr. White's teaching impeaches a very foundation truth of Biblical Theism, by denying the *immutability* of God—which he does, by his teaching as to His *nature*—he also impeaches His *actions*, and by the same *rule*; that is, because he cannot *understand* some of his dealings, as they are not all formed upon *his* model.

Thus, he says (p. 513): "consider the proposition, that the Fall of Adam, brought upon himself, 'for one

offence,' an *eternity* of sufferings—and brought this same penalty upon his posterity—whether by gratuitous imputation of guilt in which we had no share—or by the inevitable consequence and operation of a corrupt nature, transmitted to us—or by the unasked possession of immortality, either in the half or the whole of our nature—and then say whether the provision of some such method as the gospel, does not appear to be demanded by rigid equity." This is his special pleading to support his own theory of man's natural mortality acquired by Adam's sin; and in so doing he does not scruple to "assail," as he says;—but it is not man merely; it is the claims and acts of Deity. His special pleading for his premisses cannot save him from this; for, allow that man, by the sin of Adam, lost immortality, for himself and his descendants; the curse does not end here. If man, as a sinner, does not ultimately meet with *eternal* punishment, yet, according to Mr. White, he is "punished" not only with annihilation at last; but he receives pain by *fire*, so Mr. White thinks, for a greater or lesser period, for "ages of ages" if not for Eternity—in *some* cases at least; and all this, (unless we reject the Bible story of the Fall, altogether, and the doctrine therein of man's corruption;) he inherits, by the sin of Adam, in the *first* place,—yea by his *one* sin. More than this, there are the immeasurable temporal and material, as well as mental ills, which *all* suffer under, and which the Bible traces to the same source. If this be so, is not the Almighty equally chargeable with injustice, according to Mr. White, for punishing men, in this measure,

and universally, the *righteous* as well as the wicked, for guilt in which (he says) they had no share, or, of which they were not the first, or immediate cause? But Mr. White seems entirely to leave man's *own* free will out of the account, in this charge against the Deity. Neither is the Bible scheme of Redemption, as described by the Orthodox and Evangelical Churches, who do not hold to what is termed "Calvinistic principles," exempt from the condemnation with which he visits such principles. Mr. White would urge that man's *native corruption*, as the doctrine is now received and held, takes away, or bears down the power of his will, so that it is the guilt of Adam's sin, alone, for which he is punished, and not for his *own chosen and persistent wickedness*. According to his teaching, even if man *is* so provided for by God's grace in the Gospel, yet God is his *debtor*. He is not yet even *just*, for the man who suffers the concomitant ills, even in this life superinduced by Adam's sin, has *himself* done nothing to deserve *those* ills. How, therefore, does Mr. White account for them? His theory would lead him farther than he has yet gone. If God's moral government can be vindicated, and His character as *God* be held up to our supreme adoration, while He, in the course of that government, has allowed so prodigious and long-continued ills to follow *one* act of sin;—inevitably suffered from, both by the righteous, and by the wicked, in this life;—if Mr. White deems it consistent with God's character, to do this,—and moreover to punish persistently wicked men, for *literally*, ages and ages, though it be not literally for

ever ;—if Mr. White will allow that, while he cannot account for or explain this, he does yet *believe* it to be reconcileable with God's character so to do : from the very *same* premiss, we may legitimately argue, as well as believe, that He can, with justice and with goodness, do *more* than this ; even punish sinners for ever and ever, although the details of such procedure we cannot yet estimate, because we cannot understand. Our only alternative—(logically)—is positive Atheism.

There is yet one more fact that I must notice. He says (p. 513) : “If any one of *us* had the power of framing a race of immortal creatures, whom we should deliberately bring into being under a law of damnation to eternal misery, without redemption, we should know what to think and to say of such a fiend in human form.” Mr. Constable uses similar language.

Here again we trace the same Rationalistic principle, and the same fallacy of argument. “To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal ? saith the Holy One.” (Is. 40 : 25). If our conceptions of what is good, in this case, (requiring us to be in possession of *all* the facts and attendant circumstances and relations,) must manifestly be defective and inadequate ; much more must we be unable to estimate Him who is the *absolute personification* of good. God charges man, as a sinner, with putting “darkness for light and light for darkness, bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter ;” and not only is this the inseparable effect of *sin*, but His angels are by Him “charged with folly.” It was by the exhibition of God's inestimable and absolute perfections that Job was convinced and supported in his *faith*, when his

reason failed to help him under his trials. Such is the instinctive teaching of faith, with respect to God and His ways. Our arguments concerning God, what He is, and what He will do, cannot be based upon our imperfect apprehensions of good, for that were to make ourselves to be God, and not Him.

They can, therefore, only be based upon the *facts* of His creation and government in the present, and upon the explicit statements of His Revealed will.

(B.)—NATURE OF SIN.

This is the second great fundamental doctrine of Holy Scripture that is contravened by Mr. White and his friends.

Undoubtedly it is a “stone of foundation;” and “this theodicy” has the distinction, which they esteem to be enviable, of removing, or at least of endeavouring to shake such a foundation, laid in the plain teaching of Holy Scripture.

Let us first notice the position taken by our Church, upon this subject in her 9th Article. Here, she expressly affirms that “it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam.” That such position is fully sustained by facts and Bible-teaching, is certain. Mr. White, however, tells us. “There is some poison in the *blood*, running through all generations, and alienating man from the life of God.”

Here let us notice, that the *source* of native corruption is, *not in the moral nature*, but in the *blood*, so that the

great evil of the curse was *primarily* a physical and ontological one. "A poison in the blood, alienating man from the life of God!"

Here at least, he is consistent with himself. Yet, as to the extent of native degeneracy, he is not explicit. He leaves us to *infer* the extent; in accordance with the fact that the *primary* evil of the curse, is a poison in the blood, and the loss of immortality. He tells us, however that, "This natural ruin, consists in the paralysis of the $\pi\nu\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha$ or spiritual faculty, which no longer sees, or wills, as is necessary for a life in union with God."—p. 303-4. But, as he herein adopts the theory of Mr. Heard, what is lacking in clearness in the one, may be explained by the other.

Mr. Heard says: (Tri. Part. Nat. of Man. page 167,) "Thus the defect of good in every man, as naturally born into the world, turns the character into evil. Original or birth-sin is thus not so much our fault, *crimen*; it is rather our misfortune, *culpa*."

So again: (p. 181,) "It is a matter of fact, that as men come into the world by mediate descent from Adam, not by an immediate act of God's creative will, so they come into the world with infirmities, and under disabilities, which, if it does not remove responsibility, restricts it." "To our mind the *negative* or *privative* idea of birth-sin is quite sufficient to explain the facts of the case." p. 184. So also, he objects to the statement of our Article, where we say "the Apostle doth confess that concupisence and lust hath of *itself* the nature of sin."

I will but mention, in addition, that as he says that

“imputed sin, and imputed righteousness, stand or fall together;” he does “not see ground in the New Testament, for the distinction between *imputed* and *inherent* righteousness, on which the Reformers laid such stress; and so *the distinction between original and actual guilt, looks like a scholasticism*. He himself declares such a distinction upon this very page (182). * The *actual* distinction, however, is this: the *bad* as related to the *fruit*. From *his* point of view, he would not only mitigate the character of original guilt, that it is *negative* or *privative*, and *not positive*; but also of *actual* guilt, or *deeds* of sin,—“impregnated (as he says, p. 182,) by the will.” The far reaching consequences of such a theology, I can here but notice.

Our Reformers let us be thankful, saw farther than Mr. Heard, into God’s law of Truth, and were better logicians and better theologians than he. Another very false theological principle, as to Regeneration, or quickening of the *πνεῦμα*, is asserted upon p. 185; viz., were the *πνεῦμα* quickened from infancy, such person could not *sin at all*. This of course asserts that the moral virus of Original Sin, either is *taken away* by such Regeneration; or else, that no moral virus is *transmitted*. All this is conceived, (it might be said fancifully construed,) thus, as it appears to favour the

* “It is only when desire has been impregnated by the will, that sin properly so called, *i. e.*, as the transgression of the law, is produced.” Here, I remark that the *ἀρνία* referred to by St. John, (1 John 3:4) is absolute, as such; and, by all analogy of Holy Writ, is so regarded before any overt *act* of sin has been committed.

theory of the Trichotomy, and is contrary not alone to our 9th article, but to Holy Scripture.

But, leaving the Negative view of Original Sin, let us now look at it from the Positive side. First, in view of historical facts of the world we live in, facts of the past and of the present; let us ask whether this privative view of Original Sin is sufficient to account for the enormous crimes, the revolting cruelty, the rapacity and wickedness, in every form, therein manifested, individually, socially and nationally?

Let us also not forget, that this sin, which is traced back to its original source, and derived from our first parents, is the cause of evil, great and enormous, not only Civilly, but Religiously. It is not only in the world of those who believe not, but in the Church of those who do profess to believe, that this evil is operating. Religion is wounded in the house of its friends. The world is hurt by that very body, that is set for its evangelization and blessing. The words of the Apostle are true now, as then, "The Name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through *you*, as it is written."

Look at the bloody record of that Church, whose deeds of cruelty have never been exceeded, if paralleled, by any body of men! Look at the horrid Inquisition and bloody Bartholomew's day, for instance! But we need not suppose that it is limited to that Church. See the Primitive Church, not merely as persecuted, but as persecutors of its own members! I doubt whether the character of Original Sin, ever was manifested more sorrowfully, than in the days of religion's truest pros-

perity, and greatest glory. Look at the history of Ancient Israel, in Egypt, in the wilderness, in Canaan, under the greatest advantages, and under diversified trials, by the hand of Jehovah, and what does it tell of Original Sin? for here is the solution of the problem, and here is the corrupt source of such obdurate wickedness!

So also, may it be remarked of the obduracy and blindness of Pharaoh and the plagues of Egypt: for it is said of Jehovah, "for this cause have I raised thee up, to shew in thee *my* power, and that *my* name may be declared throughout all the earth." To adduce no more instances, let us ask how will Mr. White or Mr. Heard account for such appalling wickedness? Is it to education and Providential circumstances, such is to be ascribed? If not, whence comes such tangible and awful, though yet *unmeasured* evil? Shall we say it is from Satan, and so relieve man? or, shall we say with the materialists that it is altogether from sin, and that there is no personal devil?

If the former, it is indeed man's *misfortune*, and he is no longer accountable: if the latter, it is altogether his *fault*, because it is his own act and choice; but neither explanation meets the facts of the Divine record.

As there is *spiritual* help provided for man, in a spiritual conflict with spiritual evil, to cope with which he by his own powers is insufficient; so the *law of sin* within him, (which cannot be otherwise defined than as a *moral* or *spiritual* evil,) is stimulated by evil spirits led on by their great leader Satan.

Neither is there any *natural difference* in men, that,

aided by any circumstances of advantage, or, hindered by disadvantage, does, of itself, account for such enormities of evil, to which I have referred; neither may we say that, to God-ward, there is any essential difference in man, without the agency of the Holy Spirit, whatever may be the degrees of difference in the development of his nature to *man-ward*.

The true solution of any *radical* difference between man and man, is found in the words of John Bunyan, when, seeing a murderer pass to execution, he said, "There goes John Bunyan, but for the *grace of God*."

That maturity, or development of evil, which men attain to here, is under circumstances of moral trial which render them *justly* responsible.

The *climax* of Original Sin, is but in strict oneness with its character and *original*. No man goes unwillingly to Hell, in those steps by which his moral nature ripens him for it. Although it be from lust to sin, and *sin* to death; or from earthliness to sensuality, and thence to devilry. There is after all, entire *homogeneity*; and the stone of the apex, is of the same material as the stone of foundation. The seed produces fruit, after its own kind; and that by a law of its own character and conformation.

The language of our article (9) is strictly correct. Man is very far gone (*quam longissimé distet*), from original righteousness, and is *of his own nature inclined to evil*.

Having lost God's moral image, not in part, but entirely, in his moral tastes and predilections, he is

subject to *another law*, radical and inherent. For this reason he needs to be born from above, *avωθεν*.

In confirmation of the above, and of the fact that Original Sin is not Negative or Privative, but Positive in its character, I point to a fact that is patent and clear: viz., that man's moral nature is attracted *from God*, and not *to Him*. The testimony of Scripture is thus fully borne out, "My people have committed *two evils*. They have forsaken *me*, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." Jer. 2:13. So also Job: "they say unto God, depart from us for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways." Job 21: 14. The fact and the testimony refers also, not merely to an act or series of acts, but to a *law inherent*, and a *habit confirmed*.

I have said more than I intended upon this head. I will now briefly notice, that such a view of Original Sin, as is held by Mr. White and Mr. Heard, is contradicted by all the experience of those who are born of God and are led by His Spirit. Here is a science of spiritual things that is trustworthy, because of the *teacher*. That teacher is the Holy Ghost. It is a teaching, too, that is accompanied with tangible results, and can be corroborated by testimony of "many witnesses."

Those witnesses Mr. White or Mr. Heard will doubtless admit, are *credible* witnesses. I make bold to say, and herein I appeal to the instinct of the Christian mind, that the deceitfulness, the malignity, the undying antagonism of sin, in the experience of the Christian, cannot be too much magnified. Let it be stated never

so strongly, the Christian believer will not say that it is too much. Still less will he say that it is negative, and not positive. Such may be said by him who has not experimental acquaintance of its working upon his own heart, or who is, herein, unaccountably led astray by the spirit of evil.

Here too, we may most properly look for a correct knowledge of *facts*, as to Original Sin. The sinner knows little about it, as he is befooled by it. The Christian man, who is really engaged in a war with it, knows what an obstinate and subtle principle he has to contend with. Further, the greater the advance he makes in Divine knowledge and Divine grace, the more does he groan over his own sinfulness and moral corruption. "My leanness, my leanness, woe unto me!"

With *such*, too, it is realized that it is not merely a defect, but a positive enmity that he has to watch against. This is ever "lusting against the spirit."

Our Article (9) truly says, "this infection of nature doth *remain* yea in them that are regenerated," and though it be not charged against them because of their being in Christ,—their Divine renewal *does not abolish it*:—it is only when, by reason of a confirmed habit, choice, love and prevailing practice, and life according to a new nature; they lay down conflict with life, they shall be *free* from it. Then they shall "awake after God's likeness, and be satisfied with it."

I will not here make quotations in proof, from the writings of those who are acknowledged as just authorities. I may, however, mention the names of Beveridge, Hall, Baxter, Owen, and Leighton.

I will but add, that those who are justly entitled to rank as great and competent Doctrinal Theologians, have been, and are, men who have "sounded the depths" of practical and experimental religion.

My last appeal from the teaching of Mr. White's theodicy, shall be to the manifold and weighty testimonies of Holy Scripture as to the nature of sin.

Some few of these, only, will I quote. Jeremiah's words as to the heart of man, may come first.

"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" Jer. 17: 9.

Prov. 4: 23. "Keep thy heart with all diligence, (Margin, 'above all keeping') for out of it are the issues of life."

"He that trusteth in his own heart, is a fool."

Prov. 28: 26.

Our Lord says, "Out of the heart of man proceed evil thoughts," &c. Mark 7: 21. So He says, "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation." Mark 13: 33. "Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments." Rev. 16:15.

St. Paul warns us lest we be "hardened through the deceitfulness of sin." Heb. 2: 13.

St. Peter tells us to beware "lest being led away by the error of the wicked we fall from our own stedfastness." 2 Pet. 3: 17.

I will not accumulate testimony. I will but say, what says Holy Scripture: "Grace, (but grace only), shall reign, through justification unto eternal life."

The Apostle's great hope was, that God was "able to keep what he had committed to Him against that day."

There is the widest contrast possible, between Philosophical Morality, and the Religion of Jesus Christ, as there is diversity in their original ; and there can be no fusion of them, nor admixture between them.

(c.)—NATURE OF REGENERATION.

Next in order, I proceed to consider how Mr. White's theodicy, affects the established doctrine of the Orthodox and Catholic Church concerning Regeneration. This also is a most grave and important matter. I shall therefore first quote his own teaching as to its nature and effects. At page 303 of his book, he propounds the question, "What is the spiritual change effected in this life by Regeneration ?" He answers : (1) "Transformation into the moral likeness of Christ," (2) Partaking of an immortal *nature*; or to use his own words, "passing from death into life, entering into that life of Christ, the second man, which is eternal—obtaining 'a hope full of immortality' through union with the Eternal Spirit." Here let it be noticed, he puts *moral transformation* first in the list ; of which, hereafter.

After the remarkable statement concerning moral degeneracy, that, "there is some poison in the *blood* running through all generations, and alienating man from the life of God ;" he proceeds to say, (what we will readily allow) that religion is *love*; the love of God and man. Upon page 305 he says, "It is, then, a moral change in the *character* of the soul, and not an ontological, or physical change in its substance, which is the

condition of salvation, and the present result of the indwelling of the Spirit.

“‘The Spirit is life because of righteousness’ (Rom. 8: 10). This is the answer to those who object that regeneration is represented by us as a physical change in the structure of the soul. We are not of those who so represent it. It is a change wholly spiritual.” We need go no further, nor enter upon the Arminian view that follows.

We have ascertained that Mr. White puts *first in order*, in his definition of Regeneration, a *new birth* of man as to the character of his soul, a *moral change*, not an *ontological* one.

Let us now go back and see how this agrees with his definition, as to the *prime* evil of the Fall, and the *primary* meaning of Death. It is evident that Regeneration must be the restoring of that which was lost at the Fall, and that the order in value and importance, in estimating the good *lost* must obtain in estimating the good *restored*. Here, however, Mr. White again appears with an illogical as well as an unscriptural argument. He is not arguing from his own premisses, but from ours. He will not allow that loss of moral conformity to God, was the prime result of the Fall, or that such is the radical idea of death,—viz., first in order and importance when applied to man’s relation to God.

The *order* in Mr. White’s estimate is seen as follows: p. 225. “For life, signifies life; and to live for ever, signifies to live for ever; and to perish, signifies not to live for ever, but to lose organized and conscious being. That is the *first*, and the natural meaning of the words.”

Again, p. 400. "In clearing up this preliminary question, so important in its bearings upon the whole controversy, let it be understood that we offer no denial of the self-evident fact that the term *life*, as used in Scripture to describe the present and future state of regenerate men, *does* include the associated ideas of holiness and happiness, arising from a new relation to God, a spiritual resurrection resulting from Redemption. (Rom. 6: 4.) No one ought to affirm that the bare idea of *existence*, is all the term includes. No one of any account does affirm it. Our position is, that the idea of *existence* is included in the meaning, is *fundamental* to it, the moral ideas associated with it *having this conception of eternal sentient being in the complex humanity, (in opposition to death, or destruction), as their basis.*" The italics are mine.

So also p. 238, still more plainly. "We propose to shew that our Lord's statements in this chapter (John 17) indicate that life meant much more than happiness, or misery; He intended by life and death, also, and *primarily*, immortality and destruction." I have italicized the word "primarily."

I think it is quite evident, that Mr. White has declared the *first* and *chief evil* of the primeval curse of "death," as the result of sin, to be the "loss of immortality." It is equally true that in consistency with *his own* premisses, and in view of our Lord's assertion in John 3: "Except a man be born anew, or from above, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven;" in consistency I say with *his own premisses* and exegesis of "death," he must declare the regeneration referred

to by our Lord, to have for its *first* and *prime good*, the conferring of immortality; or, in other words, to mean (what he repudiates) an *ontological change*. This must, by his reasoning, come first, and be the *prime good* of Regeneration.

Equally clear it is also, that his putting the moral renovation, as a secondary or associated good in such a place, must entail the irrational idea, of a *moral quality* superinduced as an effect, by a *physical cause*.

So both Scripture and reason are denied. We place the *moral evil*, as the fundamental one: so also the *moral good*, as the fundamental one.

By reason of the moral evil—physical evil is entailed—not *vice versa*.

So the moral *good* of a renewal in God's *moral image*, makes the fact of continued and eternal existence to be an *eternal good*, as it is the *preparation*, or *preliminary step* unto it; while the lack of such moral renewal, makes physical existence as a continued and perpetuated quality, to be an *essential evil*; as the *persistent choice*, and *practice* of a contrary character, to be preparative to it.

I think it is sufficiently and indisputably proved that “this theodicy,” is by Mr. White's own shewing, chargeable with holding that Regeneration *is* an ontological change. That such an idea is irrational, is, I think, self-evident, and I shall not enter into that consideration more than I have done. It is with Scripture exegesis that we have to do, and in view of all the statements of Scripture as to the Nature of Regeneration, and what must lie at the basis of it, viz., the

Nature of Sin; it is manifest that a comprehensive view of Scripture teaching upon these subjects, will not for a moment justify Mr. White in holding to the literal rendering of the word "death" in such a way as stated by him, confining it, as he does, *primarily* and *chiefly*, if not entirely, to the loss of immortality, or of being as a man. Therefore, upon grounds of Scripture, as upon those of logic, he must *alter* his premisses, as he is unwilling to *accept* their conclusion.

In view of Mr. White's position concerning Regeneration, I shall now remark how very much his Theology militates against *practical religion*. It is indeed true, that every system of Theology, gives great prominence to the doctrine of Regeneration. Every system, however, except that of Destructionism, holds in prominence in connection therewith, as the great benefit of Regeneration, either that it puts the recipient in possession of certain Ecclesiastical and Religious privileges, and *so* changes his *relations* to the Deity,—or, that it, by a spiritual and supernatural change, through the agency of the Holy Ghost, imparts to him a *moral quality* in relation to his Creator, diametrically the opposite to that of which he was, before such change, possessed of.

Mr. White's definition, in which the material quality and character of the soul obtains the chief and first place, does more militate against practical piety, than does any other opinion. In fact, the material and ontological idea, as it is *antagonistic* to the spiritual and moral quality which he professes to associate with it, must all but *nullify it* altogether. But, as reason

does not, nor does practical utility, join the two together, so neither does Holy Scripture.

The moral relations of the sinner to God in Regeneration, are the *only* relations to be regarded.

He is "a new creature," or "a new creation," morally, and *not* ontologically. "Old things are passed away, and all things are become new;" not as to the character of his soul, ontologically considered, but as to its moral affinities to the Supreme Good. The great need of *this* change; the fact of a supernatural agency being requisite for its accomplishment; the fact that this great moral and spiritual change is in the face of, and to be accomplished under circumstances of the greatest moral and spiritual *difficulty*; that it has to be wrought as a moral victory, by Divine truth and the Divine Spirit, in the mind of a moral and responsible agent, by moral suasion; and that while it is the duty of man to *act*, it is the province and power of grace to help him in so doing; these are the great truths of the Bible concerning Regeneration. The *inception* of religion, as a living and spiritual entity in the human soul, is a *moral miracle*. Before it can become an inherent, because a transmitted principle, there is a process that none but the Deity can trace perfectly; but the experimental Christian knows somewhat concerning it. He knows sufficient to say that such process is essentially of a *moral* and *spiritual* character; that it has come under his moral cognizance as an actuality, concerning in the deepest and most anxious way, his mind and his heart, as to his *moral relations*, towards his Creator. This is *all* of Regeneration, either as a *doctrinal* truth, or as an

experimental fact. The life, so imparted, is well defined by Scougal, as "the life of God in the soul of man." "Christ in *you*." "Your life is hid with Christ in God." "Christ *our* life." So, Holy Scripture. With what earnestness *this* is to be sought, we are distinctly told. Its character, as so depicted, cannot too fully be dwelt upon.

This life, so given, is to be guarded and cultivated with all diligence. It need only be added that while a *defective* view of its character and circumstances must be injurious; who can measure the sad, extensive, and ruinous consequences that must ensue from a Theology that, as it saps the foundation of vital piety by its doctrine of Original Sin, so it assails it with progressive injury, by its doctrine concerning Regeneration

(D.) ATONEMENT OF CHRIST.

We should not be doing justice to Mr. White, did we fail to notice the fact, that his theory of conditional immortality, contemplates, designedly and with satisfaction, the object of an entire revolution in the Evangelical scheme of Doctrinal Theology. The ontological character of man, as affected by the Fall, is the foundation stone of the system. And, as he holds that the *primary* consequence of the Fall, was an *ontological* consequence, and not a moral one; so also must the character of the *recovery* be an *ontological* one also. Regeneration, however, is but the subjective *effect* of belief in the atonement.

The atonement of Christ believed in, in the heart of

man, is the *meritorious* cause of such regeneration, even as the spirit of Christ is the *efficacious* cause. We have seen how Mr. White's doctrine governs his ideas of regeneration, of the nature of sin, and also of the character of God. We can see also their logical connection with each other, and with the atonement; and now I purpose to consider in detail, the effect of Mr. White's premiss, upon this most important doctrine. I cannot do so, however, without making the remark that the man who can conceive the idea of taking to pieces that consistent, grand, and stable fabric of Evangelical and Orthodox Theology, that in all its essential features has been transmitted to us from the earliest ages of the primitive Church; and which has been further consolidated and enriched by the learning and piety of a noble host of *worthies*, "the excellent of the earth," for their experimental knowledge of Christianity, and for their massive Theological erudition; must indeed be largely gifted, with the belief in his own individual, and concentrated attainments. But Mr. White thinks he has been lucky enough, in this enlightened 19th Century to find the Philosopher's stone. He has found a panacea, for every, or at least, in his opinion, for a *great many* evils indeed, that the church is afflicted with:—and he has found it in the theory of conditional immortality.

Let us first understand, what Mr. White tells us,—p. 242: "under the general doctrine of this work, salvation signifies being literally saved alive, saved from the destruction of body and soul in hell, saved from being burned up like chaff in unquenchable fire.

That is to say—literal preservation of *being*—conferring, or restoring lost immortality. Moral qualities come in as *accidents*; but this is the *element*. The sin of Adam, by its imputation to us, has entailed upon us death of the body and of the soul; that is, we have, through Adam, become mortal in the *fullest sense*. Christ's sufferings are imputed to those who believe in Him. They, as a consequence, inherit ontological immortality: all others are extinguished at death, and to them there is no resurrection. But, Mr. White holds that there will be to such, *literally*, a “second death.” In undergoing this, they will be *punished*—some, it may be, for “ages,” then they will utterly die. The sin of Adam merited the *first* death, and man's *own* sins merit the *second*. Where, however, he gained this information, and upon what authority he delivers such dogma, he does not tell us. We want chapter and verse, and a little more, for such an oracular statement. That, however, is Mr. White's theory; and because he admits the Divinity of Christ, there must be some further atonement paid by Christ, besides mortal death. This suffering, however, did not fall upon Christ's humanity, but upon His Divinity. Mr. White is very zealous for “forensic justification,” but the “forensic justification” which Christ has merited for the sinner, does not allow Him as a sinless *man* to *suffer* for sinners. Such would not be by any means *allowable*, however willing Christ may have been to do so. Consequently such suffering, *apart* from His bodily death, fell upon His Divinity. So let us notice, it was not only God punishing God;—(not the God-man, but *God*;)—God

making *atonement to God*. True it is, Mr. White (page 512, note,) says that he considers (in order to explain the cry of our Saviour, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me"?) that the Divine Word was *sufficiently* distinct from the Father to empty Himself and to lay aside the form of God; (Phil. 2: 9), and therefore was sufficiently distinct to become the subject of suffering by the hiding of the Father's face in the agony of the passion." How this will agree with our Lord's words, "I and my Father are *one*," "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father," is beyond *Mr. White's* ability even, to demonstrate. But in the same note he tells us that, "we ought not to think that the Father suffered less in *inflicting* the punishment than the Son in *bearing* it."

So that we reach the same end at last. God atoning to God. Moreover, we are told on the contrary (Is. 53: 10), "It *pleased* the Lord to bruise Him." The verb here is γַּדֵּל yāfatz. Bishop Lowth renders the passage, "Yet it pleased the Lord to crush Him with affliction. The verb requires this construction; namely, "the Lord was favourable."

We will now look at another argument of Mr. White's concerning the Atonement. It is a fair specimen of the language of his friend, Mr. Constable, upon the same subject. "If any of us had the power of forming a race of immortal creatures, whom we should deliberately bring into being under a law of damnation to eternal misery, without redemption, we should know what to think and to say of such an omnipotent *fiend* in human form. If He who kindled the 'furnace' of

hell-fire, in defence of that law which is fulfilled in love, should have thus deliberately brought an entire race into an immortal existence in which there was *no escape* from eternal woe either through free will or redemption, unquestionably those voices must have been struck dumb which proclaim that 'the whole earth is full of His glory.' (pp. 513, 514.)

This is *part* of an argument concerning the atonement as provided of God; its character as proceeding from Him. Either, says Mr. White, God did or He did not make man, or man so continues after the Fall, an immortal being. If He did *not* so continue immortal, God could properly, as God, take away, or not confer upon him immortality. If He *did* continue immortal He *must*, to be God, provide an atonement. Now let us see from what premisses Mr. White starts. He grounds his major premiss thus: "God *is*: I know perfectly *what sin is*; therefore I know perfectly *what God is*: so, God should do, as *I* would do: but God has not done what *I* would have done; therefore He is *not* God." This may be made to apply to the *knowledge* of God, the *justice* of God, or the *love* of God; and it comes to this—either that the revealed will of God is the absolute and sovereign law,—or else the judgment of Mr. White.

But let us look at it from another side. Mr. White says (p. 513): "Let any one consider the proposition that the fall of Adam brought upon himself for 'one offence' an eternity of sufferings—and brought this same penalty upon us, his posterity—whether by gratuitous imputation of guilt in which we had no share, or by the inevitable consequence and operation

of a corrupt nature transmitted to us, or by the unasked possession of immortality either in the half or the whole of our nature, and then say whether the provision of some such method as the Gospel, does not appear to be demanded by *rigid equity*." This again is only part of Mr. White's argument, which is thus: "Man should not be made, or continued immortal *against his will*; if so, *justice* requires that an atonement should save him from evil: but the atonement is a gift of *love*; therefore God has done, as *I* think that He should have done." He argues in a circle (pp. 512-14). We will first shew the fallacy of his argument as to the justice of God. As he first disputed the supreme *knowledge* of God, so does he dispute His supreme *authority*, as creator, by making a law for Him who is the *source* of all law. I meet this *leemand* of Mr. White, in this way; designedly. The fountain of Law is *necessarily just*: and, as God, as His knowledge is perfect; so his *authority* over His creatures is *absolute*; and He himself *defines* that justice, and not Mr. White: unless *he*, not *God*, is the source and criterion of both *knowledge*, and of just and supreme authority.

But *thirdly*, Mr. White says: (a) God is a God of love, *ergo*, 1. He will not punish sinners for ever. 2. He has provided the Atonement, which is of love: for, (b) the Scriptures so speak of it as God's gift, that He "so loved the world, that He *gave* His only begotten son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life." Mr. White's view of Holy Scripture, as well as his view of the character of God is *ex parte* and erroneous, for Holy Scripture speaks

elsewhere of the atonement as reconcileable with *all* His attributes. As the manifestation of Divine wisdom and knowledge: Col. 1: 26-27 ; 2: 1-3. As a provision to satisfy Divine justice: Rom. 3 : 24-26. As an exertion of Divine power: Eph. 1 : 19, 20 ; 1 Cor. 1 : 23, 24. And also as the expression of Divine love: John 3 : 16. But viewed in its entirety, and in its relation, not merely to one, but to all the attributes of Deity; we are told that " Mercy and Truth have met together, Righteousness and Peace have kissed each other." Psalm 85 : 10.

God was just on Calvary, as well as on Sinai. He is loving at all times, even as Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. The Atonement, as the Word of God sets it forth, gives to our view the fact of Jesus Christ, as our federal Head, suffering in His sinless humanity for the sins of men ; and so it maintains the integrity and perfection of Divine justice ; but in the same Atonement we behold the love of God displayed. Of the Father in sending, of the Son in willingly going, and giving His Divine Personality to union with humanity, for this purpose ; and when so incarnate, in patiently and devotedly suffering, in His human and sinless nature, for man's sin. Of the Holy Ghost, in co-operating, according to His special office in the covenant of Redemption, with the work of the Messiah ; in succouring Him personally in His manhood, in the work of obedience which belonged thereto, and in blessing by His influences the truth of His Word, as it testifies in itself, or by His messengers, to the Anointed Saviour. In other words, it is the love

of *God*, and not that quality merely as man apprehends it.

This, I take, to be a logical and a scriptural view of the atonement of Christ. I do not here discuss the heterodoxy of the principle that the Deity is capable of suffering, as I have done so elsewhere.

I have before remarked, that Mr. White strongly objects that Christ as an innocent man should suffer to God-ward for human sins; but it is every where in Scripture so spoken of. St. Peter says: "He died the just for the unjust." Mr. White will go so far as to allow of His dying a human death; but he will not allow that the expiatory sacrifice of Christ was paid in the human nature: in His passion and sufferings, positive and peculiar, when God hid his face from Him. On what authority he endeavours to distinguish between one and the other, (*i. e.*, His death—and His agony in Gethsemane and upon the Cross), he does not say; but certain it is, that our justification (Heb. 2: 9-14) before God is ascribed to the death of Christ, and our cleansing to His "blood." (1 John 1: 7. 1 Pet. 1: 18, 1.) Moreover, our justification is directly associated with His Person as Messiah, and not with His Divine personality. (Rom. 3: 24, 26: 5: 15, 20.) The teaching of Holy Scripture is most explicit, that as it was man that sinned so it was man that suffered. On such a representation, alone, could it commend itself to our moral sense: Mr. White to the contrary notwithstanding, and such is the clear teaching of our just and only authority in this matter, even God's Word, that as Adam sinned as our federal head, so the-

second Adam suffered, obeyed, atoned, rose, and ascended for us.

I now desire to impress this fact upon the reader, that the revealed will of God must be read with a deep and prayerful recognition of dependence upon its Divine author. That we are to study that Word with the most sincere and fervent petition to Him, that He from whom alone comes *that* knowledge and help which we need as sinners, may teach us to know and incline us to *do* His will. That while we have a firm persuasion, that each of His attributes, or moral qualities, are inflexible and perfect; that they are—in the Gospel, exhibited and extended to us—set forth in the most perfect harmony. That while God is—as God,—absolute and supreme; He is to be believably regarded as the “rewarder of all such as diligently seek Him.”

(E.)—INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

“ ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable, for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”—ii. Tim. 2 : 16, 17.

The doctrine thus delivered to us in Holy Scripture, concerning its place and authority in the minds of men, in things pertaining to God, is impeached by Mr. White, and others, his general sympathizers. It is true that Mr. White professes to ground his argument concerning the doctrine of Future Punishment upon Scripture testimony ; but, as I have already shewn, he

has carried with him to such exegesis of Holy Scripture; predilections, manifested in his own survey of the scientific evidence, for the *inferences* which materialists have drawn therefrom, for their "philosophy, falsely so called." But it is not alone evident by such indirect proof that Mr. White's view of the Inspiration of the Scriptures is radically defective.

I shall now adduce certain passages from his book, to manifest this fact more clearly. I shall first, however, premise, that his statement that "a few texts" which he and his friends can dispose of in no other way than by a direct attack upon the plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures, in their several parts; are *not* the only groundwork of our belief in, and reception of, the Catholic doctrine upon this subject. I have shewn, I think, logically, scripturally, and fairly, beginning with the original curse denounced against sin, and pursuing the historical testimony of Scripture in a general chronological order; and have even given the "crucial words," as used by St. John in his Gospel, where Mr. White thinks "the fairest battle ground" of the whole controversy may be found, the precedence in such order of consideration; and if, in such impartial enquiry into the teaching of Holy Scripture, the general scope of such teaching is against him; the "few texts," which present a difficulty, in themselves considered, even to his mind, should carry,—and they *will*, to the minds of those to whom such previous evidence is satisfactory and sufficient;—a positive and decided conviction as to the harmony and unity of such Scripture evidence as a whole.

On page 422, he speaks of "an element of human limitation and infirmity in its pages;" and on page 423 he says: "So long as men read it with minds that recognize in every writer a mechanical instrument through which 'the Holy Spirit' has written a certain number of equally infallible 'texts,' it is impossible they can allow themselves even to see the discrepancies contradictions, and omissions of the minor sort which have crept into the writings of some of the holy and learned men who have 'taken in hand' to write for us the history of the Redemption and the Redeemer. It becomes a part of piety not to study phenomena so unedifying, and so fatal to the preconceived theory of what a 'Protestant Bible' ought to be."

None, I think, can fail to see the irony and philosophic scorn that underlies these remarks. That genuine, humble reverence for, and dependence upon God's teaching in His Word, is wanting. But, again: "The indefensible method, moreover, of citing the books of the Bible as if some one had beheld an angel inditing them in succession, without consideration of their individual history, of the *degree of confidence* due to the fullness of each writer's information, of the *positive marks of defective knowledge* or *misconception* in some, will serve the cause of truth no longer." So, also: "I cannot conceal my conviction that the path of duty and of wisdom in dealing with such documents as the Gospels, demand this practical conclusion; if they offer to us any statements of Christ's doctrine by excess or defect, conspicuously disagreeing with the facts, or with the plain sense of His teaching, as recorded by the same,

or other historians, resolutely to refuse to allow such exceptional misreports, or omissions, to interfere with the truth which has been learned by a wider survey of the evidence." (pp. 524-5.) That is to say, that if any particular text, or texts of Holy Scripture does not or do not agree with *my* ideas of the scope of Scripture teaching on any given subject, said texts must go to the wall. By such a procedure, man is at liberty to believe just *such portions* of Scripture as suits his purpose.

Upon this principle Mr. Cox, author of "Salvator Mundi," very quietly eliminates first one part, then another, of Holy Scripture, as inadmissible in evidence, and then proceeds to consider certain words in their abstract meaning, and so to destroy all that specific teaching which they derive from the context.

I am sorry to see that Dr. Farrar has some sympathy with Mr. White in his view of Inspiration (see p. 63 *et seq.* and excursus 5); and it is, I think, clear that his (Canon Farrar's) general views concerning Future Punishment must be traced to the fact that he argues more from his own preconceived opinions than he does from implicit regard to the Inspired Word. I must make another quotation from Mr. White. "In a large collection of books, the works of authors living in different ages through fifteen centuries, at different distances from God, enjoying different measures of that afflatus which sometimes lifted up a prophet to the third heaven, and sometimes only to the first, and sometimes did not lift him up from the earth at all, but left him to obtain, like St. Luke, 'a perfect understanding'

by personal enquiry,—it is vain to anticipate a *uniform terminology in doctrine, or an equal comprehension of the truths of redemption*” (p. 425).

According to Mr. White, we may believe more or less of *which writer* we please, and to *that* writer yield just so much *credence* as suits us.

With such views of Revelation as Mr. White holds, it is rather superfluous so far as *he* is concerned; and it may only be regarded, as in deference to a popular prejudice, that he elaborates a system of Theology out of the Scriptures *at all*. In order to justify himself in throwing discredit on St. Matthew on account of that decisive passage—ch. 26: 46—he proceeds to quote an example of defect in St. Matthew’s account of the fall of Jerusalem and coming of Christ, as if that were valid evidence against him, as a plenary inspired witness. But Mr. White must know very well that such an omission is not peculiar to St. Matthew; as, upon the same subject, nothing is more frequent through the Old and New Testaments, than to find that additional information is given in another book, in order to give all that *God sees fit to reveal* upon that subject.

Take, for instance, David’s numbering Israel. Thus 1 Chron. 21: 1, tells us: “Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel”; while 2 Sam. 24: 1 tells us: “And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and *He* moved David against them to say, go number Israel and Judah.” Was the author of the Book of Samuel an incompetent witness? By no means! So of the many acts of our Saviour recorded in the Gospels: we find frequent instances

where additional information is given by one Apostle, to that afforded by another.

Thus St. Matthew, recounting the call of Peter (Matt. 4: 18), says: "Jesus, walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren," &c. St. Luke 5: 2, says: "And it came to pass as the people pressed upon Him to hear the Word of God, he stood by the Lake of Gennesaret." Is St. Matthew an incompetent witness, and is his testimony either more or less inspired because he does not speak of the people "pressing upon Him to hear the Word of God;" or because he does not mention the fact of Jesus going into Peter's fishing boat? Any reason is better than none at all, if it will serve the turn, it would appear, according to Mr. White's philosophy.

Let us hear a little good, sober, sound teaching upon Inspiration.

Mr. Lee, in his work on Inspiration, page 31, says: "The various parts of Holy Scripture, then, I would again repeat, in order to be rightly understood, or justly valued, must be regarded as the different members of *one vitally organized structure*; each performing its appropriate function, and each conveying its own portion of the truth." He then proceeds to speak of the two Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John: one most serviceable against the Gnostics, the other against the Ebionites—one omitting what the other supplies.

What is true of the Gospels as a *whole*, is true of their several accounts of *particular* truths contained therein.

With regard to that vain distinction which Mr. White attempts to draw between the degrees of knowledge and of afflatus, &c., in the several writers; I will quote again from the same sound and learned theologian, p. 41: "I repeat, in whatever degree or manner, this actuation by the Holy Spirit may have been exercised: for it should never be forgotten that the real question with which our enquiry is concerned is the *result* of this Divine influence, as presented to us in the Holy Scriptures, *not* the manner according to which it has pleased God that this result should be attained. Moses unquestionably received more abundant tokens of the Divine favour than Ezra or Nehemiah, or the author of the Book of Chronicles; but this does not render that element of the Bible, in composing which Moses was the agent, one whit more true or more accurate in its details than the writings of the others.

The disciple whom Jesus loved, and who reclined upon His bosom, enjoyed far higher personal privileges than St. Mark or St. Luke; but still this affection of his Divine Master, does not render St. John's Gospel in one single feature, a more trustworthy vehicle of Divine truth which it conveys, than the records of those who who were but companions of the Apostles."

So again: "The opinion that the subject matter alone of the Bible proceeded from the Holy Spirit, while its language was left to the unaided choice of the various writers, amounts to that fantastic notion which is the grand fallacy of many theories of Inspiration; namely, that two different spiritual agencies were in operation, one of which produced the phraseology in

its outward form, while the other created within the soul the conceptions and thoughts of which such phraseology was the expression. The Holy Spirit, on the contrary, as the productive principle, embraces the entire activity of those whom He inspires, rendering their language the Word of God. (1 Thes. 2: 13.) The entire substance and form of Scripture, *whether resulting from revelation or natural knowledge*, are thus blended together in one harmonious whole: direct communications of religious truth, as well as the inferences which the Sacred Writers adduced therefrom; the lessons to be learned, whether from exhibitions of miraculous power, or from the facts of history; such matters, together with all the collateral details of Scripture, have been assimilated into one *homogeneous* organization by the vital energy of the Spirit."

P. 45.

This is a sound and rational account of Inspiration. It is not the "mechanical theory," which regards the man's faculties as inert, and bearing no part in the work, but it makes the composition which we call "the Bible;" whether "a few texts," or a whole book, or many books; to be infallibly, truly and perfectly the Word of God: a Divine communication, perfectly and entirely reliable, and, to Christians, of unquestioned authority, as an absolute rule of truth, in things pertaining to God. Accepting such premisses as true with regard to inspiration, one "text," if belonging to the Inspired canon, and clear in its testimony, would be valid evidence; and *one* such text against Mr. White's theory, ought to make him pause and consider whether he and his

Theology *may* not be wrong: but much more, should *several* of such texts, which he cannot satisfactorily, even to his own mind, dispose of, save by depreciating the authority of Inspiration.

Such a fact, however, to every one who holds the Bible to be a perfect rule of faith and morals—the fact that the ground of his faith is sought to be undermined by the writer of any book; will be, to him a sufficient and conclusive argument against it, and the particular theory or theories which it seeks to advance. Moreover, such a principle, as to the Word of God, if allowed to operate, must soon manifest its destructive character. “Their word will eat as doth a canker,” and “increase to more ungodliness.” (2 Tim. 2: 16, 17).

(F.) PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

This is the last of those great doctrinal issues which I have selected for notice, as arising out of this theodicy; and in which, Mr. White and his friends would make radical changes in the teaching of the Church. In this last, however, it most plainly and practically asserts its distinctive character. Well may Professor Gracey in his most sound, analytical and scathing criticism of Canon Farrar’s volume, say as he does: “Many surprising antitheses are brought about in the course of the developement of the theme, but none more surprising than that Canon Farrar has provided a common meeting place for High Churchmen, and Low Churchmen, and that meeting place is purgatory—the High Churchman’s only complaint of the

Canon being that he does not go deep enough and far enough." The remark is equally applicable in relation to both hypotheses propounded concerning Future Punishment, in their departure from the teachings of Holy Scripture, and from the orthodox belief. Universalists and Materialists find a meeting place:—and that meeting place is purgatory.

Both agree in a probation and purgation after death, and it would appear also, both of the righteous and the wicked. So at least of Mr. Heard and Mr. Cox; so also, Professor Plumptre, and Canon Farrar most distinctly intimate to us their belief in a Purgatory. Canon Farrar says that our Reformers only rejected Purgatory "in the rough." Professor Plumptre recognizes with thankfulness the fact that Mr. White admits agencies leading to repentance and reformation extending beyond the present life: (Vision of the Future p. 16,) and Professor Mayor says: "Of all the writers, (*i. e.*, commenting on Canon Farrar's book,) Dr. Allen is, I think the only one except Mr. Arthur and Professor Gracey, who regards the suggestion of a continued probation in any form, as inadmissible, notwithstanding the strongest predisposition to optimist views." (Canon Farrar's answer to his Critics, p. 31.) Here is the premiss which all the learning or "new learning" of the heterodox party lays down, but which only Dr. Littledale is ready, at once to press to its proper conclusion. A writer in "Church Bells," the Editor of which, evidently favours the modern Eschatology, prefers to leave the question of "Prayer for the departed," an "open question," at present, and

merely takes the negative ground, (*pro tem.* no doubt,) that such prayer, "though not commanded is not forbidden." Dr. Littledale, complains that Canon Farrar does not at once proceed to apply the premiss which he has laid down, as to probation in the intermediate state. He says "Dr. Farrar, while most usefully drawing attention to the unfamiliar fact, that the Jewish Church has no tradition whatever in favour of endless punishment, has failed to group visibly with it, that other fact, that Prayers for the Dead passed without break from Judaism into Christianity." (Future Punishment p. 61) I do not stop to controvert the position here taken, I will merely say that the facts are *unproved*; but while Dr. Littledale, true to his theological tenets, argues chiefly from the scholastic, and traditional stand point; he also infers that such position is, as he considers, also scripturally and *therefore* logically, as well as theologically, true. Here is our court of appeal: "To the Law and to the Testimony." We are willing to take Primitive, or Reformation Theology, for what it is properly worth; but we test both in this crucible; we weigh both in this balance. It is justly said by the learned Bingham in his Antiquities of the Church, (Book 15 ch. 3, sec. 15;) and also by Bishop Jewel and other of the Reformers, English and Continental, that the primitive Christians' remembrance of the departed faithful, was of a different character from the Romish worship, consisting of prayers *for* them and prayers *to* them; yet although this may be said by way of defence and mitigation, it does not do away with the just relation of their

practice, to the facts of Biblical teaching and Biblical theology.*

The Church of the Reformation, freed from the antecedents of its associations and the influence of long ages of Papal superstition ; the theology of Protestantism, as a system of Homiletic Truth, and contradistinguished from Sacramental, or what is now technically called "Catholic" Theology, knew nothing, knows nothing, in the matter of faith and morals, to be *allowed*, much less *required* of men, that cannot be clearly authorized and taught by Holy Scripture. The watch-word, aye, the battle-cry of this controversy, and of the conflict which all see must come, will be the words of the great Chillingworth : "The Bible, and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants." For this reason, I am not careful to consider at any length the ecclesiastical, or traditional aspect of this matter. It suffices for us that all the scope of Scripture is against the idea of prayer for the dead. It rests upon no other basis than that of philosophical speculation, or of a corrupted Christianity.

If it is reasonable, because Scriptural, to say that the righteous are Missionaries in Hades to the wicked,

* I quote the following from Bishop Jewel, as expressing the mind of our Reformers, and their position with respect to authority for the practice. Such authority they would accept, *only* from Holy Scripture.

"Prayer for the dead, is none of those articles that M. Harding hath taken in hand to prove. And therefore as his manner is, he sheweth us one thing for another. This kind of prayer although it be mere superstition, and utterly without warrant of God's Word, yet I confess it was manywheres received and used, both in Gregory's time and long before, and is avouched of Gregory by a number of vain and childish fables." (Jewel p. 743).

and are there co-workers with Christ in the conversion of the wicked dead, as Mr. Jukes and Mr. Cox tell us, and Mr. White and Mr. Heard, together with Dr. Farrar, Professor Plumptre and Professor Jellett allow ; *then*, it may be reasonably allowable and reconcileable with Scripture, not only to pray *for* them, seeing that they are, hypothetically, engaged in a pious work (and as Mr. Heard and Mr. Cox, with Mr. Jukes, supposes that they are at the same time being “salted with fire,” or themselves undergoing a purgative or sanctifying process) ; but, in consideration of their position of dignity it might, so, possibly be allowable to pray *to* them. If, however, their position as to probation in Hades is an unscriptural, and an untenable one ; then the theory and practice which they would introduce, is untenable and unscriptural too.

Moreover, and it is this, chiefly, that I would draw attention to, there is, in principle and in practice actually no dividing line, between such doctrine, in its view of the intermediate state—and all the monstrous impositions and flagrant superstitions, of that horrible and anti-christian system, which has obtained for the Church of Rome, the title of “Mother of Harlots and the abominations of the Earth,” as its Divinely-appointed and proper cognomen. Such a consideration, in view of all the history of the past, and of the solemn utterances of Inspiration, may well suggest to the disciples and teachers of the modern school of Eschatology, to re-examine by the Divine Word, the foundation on which it rests. If we are to have purgatory and prayers for the dead as integral parts of

our theological system ; do we not thereby allow that the claims of the Roman Pontiff have cogency and coherence ?

Yes ! That system is indeed homogeneous in all its parts, and self-consistent ; and in adopting any of its conclusions, we must in consistency and in reason, adopt the *ἀρχὴ*, and premiss on which they depend. The controversy now pending is a controversy concerning first principles, doctrinally as well as practically. It is not merely a question of Romanism, or Protestantism, Sacramentalism, or Homiletical Truth, Philosophy, or Revelation. It is not even one of superstition, or faith in the revealed supernatural ; but it is a question of Theism or Atheism, under the form of Christ, or Anti-Christ.

This, as I believe, is a fair statement of the issue before us : It remains to be asked of all who hold to "the faith once delivered to the saints," in view of the internal dissensions and sectarian differences, which make much of the less, and separate between brethren in the faith of a common Lord, of an Inspired Revelation of Him, and of a Covenanted Salvation : "What are you going to do, brethren, what are you going to do ?"

A COMPARATIVE VIEW OF UNIVERSALISM AND MATERIALISM.

It will, I think, be useful to compare the two great departures from the doctrine of Holy Scripture with respect to Future Punishment. A few words may suffice with respect to each of the salient features of difference. Their unity of origin it is not difficult to trace. It is philosophic perplexity with reference to the Divine Word and its teachings. It is found in a demand, in order to faith, which is not *absolutely* refused, that such Revelation as we have in the Bible, shall be capable of philosophic demonstration. Mr. Cox demands liberty to "interpret it by his reason and conscience." So Mr. White. It is more or less plainly asserted, by all who advocate the modern eschatologies. Their unity of origin, therefore, is found in philosophic rationalism: "oppositions of science falsely so called."

Their first divergence is found with respect to man's ontological qualities. Universalists receive the long established belief of the immortality of the soul; a truth which, as a foundation, underlies both Natural and Revealed Religion.

Materialists most directly and plainly support, as they require, the hypothesis of speculative scientism, and adopt, in whole, or in part, the monstrous assertions of Darwin, Huxley and Tyndal, and trace in man's ontological constitution a development from, or a similarity to, that of the brute creation. Materialism, pure and

simple, has the merit and the glory, of claiming for man an affinity with the baboon.

The Christadelphians, connect in their doctrine, somewhat the same elements as the Docetae attempted to do, in primitive times. Such a conglomeration of heterogeneous elements, at least affords to us this instruction: viz., How subtle and how malignant is the operation of Original Sin!

The Christadelphian hypothesis, although it does fondly, and with singular audacity, claim affinity with Scripture truth; yet, affords so little ground for human confidence, notwithstanding the great blindness of the natural mind, and the alienation of the heart from God; that, as a system, I have not deemed it necessary to be considered. Logically and consistently, it holds to the annihilation of the wicked at death. To them, there is no resurrection. The theory of conditional immortality is a modified form of materialism. The "tri-partite nature of man," is its foundation. Man as an animal, composed of body and soul, is developed from the brute creation.

But their saving clause, to prevent human degradation altogether, is found in their assertion of a *third* quality; but what is the proper name for it in the original, *πνεῦμα*, or *ψύχος*, *חַיִּים*, or *נֶפֶל*, they are not agreed; nor are they likely to be.

This, so far as its Scripture authority is concerned, is a radical flaw.

Further,—from its doctrinal results—of the Tri-Partite theory, the adage may apply, "The remedy is worse than the disease."

Conditional Immortality asserts a resurrection of the wicked, and an existence of one part of man in an intermediate state; but whether *πνεῦμα*, or *ψύχος*, the spirit, or the soul, the conscience or God-consciousness, or, the soul as supposed to be represented by the *middle* part of man's nature, or being, does not appear. Here, too, they are involved in philosophical, as well as in Scripture difficulty. Universalists, as they hold the immortality of the soul, are in no *such* difficulty. They hold to a resurrection, both of the righteous and the wicked. Yet it would appear that Mr. Cox, irrespective of this, holds to the new scientific "discoveries;" for he says, (p. 222), "Nor does it, *i. e.*, Universal Salvation, less accord with the demands of Science, than with the dictates of Reason and the Moral Sense; for it carries on the *evolution* of the human race through all the ages to come." I have italicized the word "evolution."

There is yet one point of difference between Modern Universalists and Materialists; which, while it may be regarded as a necessary sequence from their respective theories, is also one of great consequence to the cause of Biblical truth, and is specially worthy to be noted. Universalism, if it does not ignore, it certainly depreciates the great fact of Satanic agency in the world, and the intimate and constant influence of such agency upon mankind, from the beginning of their temptation in Eden. Human probation is pervaded by this influence, as well as by that of the creature, and by that of sin: The world, the flesh, and the devil, are a trinity of evil, and a trinity in unity. As God's revelation is progressive,

and as the revealed history of the human race is climacteric, in the assertion of a dualism of character and condition; so, the fact and the character of Satanic agency, is not only a part of such Revelation, and of such History; but from its very character, forms a corroborative and unanswerable argument for the finality of man's condition being fixed, at death: so also, for the confinement of salvation to a *part* of the human family, in whose character and conduct here, during moral trial, is found a radical and chosen separation from moral evil, as it is bound up with Satan's apostacy. From such connection, as we have no ground in Revelation to look for Satan's reclamation, and so for his forgiveness; we have no ground to look for such reclamation in those who have chosen his ways; and this is actually the case with all the unsanctified, albeit, with lesser degrees of malevolence in some cases, as with lesser degrees of light: The principle is yet the same, during that period of probation, longer or shorter, which God has in His wisdom, assigned to each.

This is a sufficiently conclusive argument against Universal Salvation.

So also, as the leading feature of God's government of His creatures, is reward or punishment by character, *i.e.* natural rewards and punishments, as a distinctive and fundamental principle; so, that principle, in itself considered, and with cumulative force of reason, when man's connection, under trial, with Satan and his influence, is duly weighed; does utterly disallow, that this principle, should in one case, culminate according

to its character, in the blessedness of the righteous man; and while the happiness of one, should be a happiness of character, attained under moral law, and *under* such law,—as its law of choice,—so, for ever blessed; and, that the punishment of the other class under a similar moral law of trial, matured and developed, by a law of its own choice, should be punished, not by a *moral*, but by a physical law, under which, its being, both physical and moral; (for so we must term it, although they will not allow that the wicked have a spirit, properly considered, save as animals have;) must perish, and for ever cease to be.

Thus, while the force derived from the fact of Satanic agency and influence, is productive of a principle of eternal punishment in the case of the wicked, and so essentially diverges from Universalism; yet, as it involves a principle by which sound logic and the teaching of Holy Scripture is alike contravened; it, as well as the contrary theory, is unworthy of man's acceptance:—as a rational being, as a Theist, or as a consistent believer, in the plenary inspiration, and authority of the Bible.*

* Here is Mr. White's statement as to progressive development of the doctrine of Satanic agency. (P. 142, *Life in Christ*.)

“The further back you go in Hebrew history, the earlier the epochs to which the Hebrew books belong, the fainter and dimmer is the character of the references to the agency of evil spirits.”

“The nearer you advance towards the maturity of Jewish thought when it was strongly influenced by Hellenic culture”—“the more pronounced and dreadful becomes the doctrine of evil spiritual agency.”

“In the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, you find it flaming out like lightning whose ‘flash hangs durable in heaven.’”

See now how his argument recoils upon himself.

But we now come to a point of agreement ; and by these occasional links by which they attach themselves, we see that there is a practical co-operation : Unity in diversity, unity in origin, unity in practical working, unity in result.

The agreement referred to, is found in purgatorial discipline, in the intermediate state. They are agreed as to this. Both Universalists and Materialists hold this to be true, of the righteous and of the wicked. Mr. Cox says, "The reward of the righteous is at once retributive and perfecting, the punishment of the unrighteous is at once retributive and remedial." P. 202. But the result at last, so far as Scripture is concerned, is, that *it* is broken, and that violence is done to its testimony, by both parties, as in the formulation of the several theories ; while, as the distinctive features of each, as a theory of Eschatology is concerned ; the one teaches the destruction or annihilation of the wicked ; the other, their ultimate renewal and salvation.

But, now let us look at the collateral issues arising out of these several systems of Eschatology, in relation to the great cardinal doctrines of the Gospel, and their

"We do not learn that any passages, except these three, (*i. e.*, Isaiah 33: 14, 66: 24, Daniel 12: 2), are cited from the Old Testament writings, in support of the *modern* (?) doctrines"—"During certainly five, and possibly six or eight thousand years, preceding the advent of Christ, there was an innumerable race of sinful creatures on earth, abandoned for the most part to hereditary superstitions, for the most part unable to read or think clearly, and nearly at the mercy of their kings and priests. Now all these seemingly mortal creatures, were all immortal, &c., &c., and liable to *everlasting misery* in hell :" (Life in Christ, p. 189), *ergo* the doctrine of Orthodoxy is not true ! But what of the Revelation of Satanic agency ? Is it not true ? By no means ! Mr. White admits that *it is*.

sources and connections. First of Natural Theology: God in Nature. Here God's nature and character is misrepresented and distorted from the facts of such Theology, and so prejudiced: notably, by Materialists, and, with *allowance*, of Universalists; if we take Mr. Cox's statement as a specimen.

With regard to Natural Religion, there is unmistakeable agreement. The very name of it is offensive to Mr. Heard. * The intuitions of our moral nature, in regard to responsibility, future life, and future judgment, are scouted as untenable by those who hold to Materialism; and they are quite in accord with speculative scientists.

Mr. White is constrained to give some honour "to the voice within the heart," but it is here constraint, and is utterly at variance with his "Theodicy." Vainly also, do Universalists also strive to maintain, that Natural Religion is not against them, and that Bishop Butler leaves room for new discoveries, in Scripture, as well as in science.

Their pleading is vain, concerning "reason and conscience;" and the latter faculty is much scandalized

* Mr. Heard says, (p. 23), "We must, however, *in limine*, protest against the so-called *system* of natural religion. Though man may, by his unaided reason, spell out one, or even two of these truths singly, yet he certainly cannot put them together, he certainly cannot reach even that elementary stage of faith spoken of in Heb. 10: 6, 'For he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.'"

He says, (p. 32), that the Orthodox Theology in endorsing Natural Religion, and holding to the immortality of the soul, does "under-prop the latter by scholastic argument!" Also, that Bishop Butler's first chapter upon Natural Religion, "might be cut out, leaving the rest of his work stronger for the rejection of this as the weakest point!"

by the connection they would seek to drag it into, as it repudiates so rationalistic a companion, if its voice may be allowed to be heard. They are united in doing violence to Natural Religion, although the reception of the immortality of the soul as a part of their system, must give a force and cogency to its claims in the eyes of Universalists, which Mr. Heard and his school will by no means allow. So, they theoretically differ and diverge from each other; while practically, Natural Religion, God's witness in the human heart and conscience, is depreciated or damaged in its character, force and authority.

We now pass on to Revealed Truth, as given to us in Holy Scripture. It has been shewn at large, how both Materialists and Universalists, dishonour and depreciate the character and authority of Revelation. I only notice the fact, now, of their agreement in so doing.

So in its interpretation, it is either distorted by rigid literalism, or by rigid allegorizing, or else, more palpably and culpably, as with equal violence to sound reason, wrested from its just connection, and, I am constrained to say, however severe it may be judged to be, "handled deceitfully." I will now, as briefly as I may, enumerate the doctrinal agreements of the two systems. The character of God, is alike limited, humanized, or blasphemed, (can we say less?) by both parties.

The nature of Original Sin, as stated in the Holy Scriptures, is quite undermined, and the foundation laid for mere philosophical morality.

Spiritual Regeneration by the Holy Ghost is, as a truth of Revelation, either transferred to an ontological change, or greatly depreciated as to its character as a pre-requisite for holiness here, and heaven hereafter. In like manner the Atonement of the blessed Saviour is either misrepresented as to its character, greatly depreciated as to its value, or made indirectly available to all, instead of those who now and here believe upon Him, by means of a compulsory purgatorial discipline, resulting in their ultimate coercion: thus invalidating or limiting the declaration of Holy Scripture, that "salvation is through grace by faith," and "not of ourselves."

The culminating point, however, is purgatory, and prayers for the dead. Here, in their agreement upon these subjects, the modern Universalists and Materialists have fully demonstrated their Anti-Christian character.

In so teaching, they actually place themselves in the position of that system, of which the voice of the Supreme Judge, speaking of her coming and awful judgment, says: "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." (Rev. 18: 4.)

THE MODERN *VIA MEDIA*, AS REPRESENTED BY PROF. BIRKS.

In the previous chapter, I have endeavoured to compare the systems of Universalism, and Materialism, with each other; and to shew by such a summary of their teaching, the relation which they bear to each other, and to the teaching of Holy Scripture.

Our view of the present state of this great controversy, would not be complete, did we not also take into consideration another theory: not very clearly stated by any one, yet with most plainness by Prof. Birks; who rejects the teachings of orthodoxy, in its integrity, and in one of its essential features.

He equally disclaims both Universalism and Materialism: how far he is in unison with the former, I will endeavour to shew. Be it first remarked, that Canon Farrar, also rejects Universalism and Materialism. Yet we cannot distinguish between his teaching and Universalism. So, of Prof. Plumptre, and, I imagine, of Prof. Mayor.

I suspect that Prof. Birks's theory, in its coherency, as it involves a theodicy of its own, will be found to include the above-named gentlemen in the same category, although their ideas are but negatively expressed.*

* Canon Farrar says (p. 64, Answer to his Critics) "The hope of *militagio*, the *refrigeria*, the remissions, which God may grant hereafter, the cessation of a maddening agony and a gnawing remorse, is surely a very different thing from the assertion that all sinners will

In the notes upon several important topics involved in this discussion, I shall have occasion to refer more particularly to Prof. Birks's teaching; I shall, here, but summarize and trace his system to its Theological and Scripture basis. The procuring cause of his theory, is found, chiefly, in his view of the nature and efficacy of the atonement of Christ; but naturally, in order to its logical consistency, he traces such cause further back. The atonement of Christ, must of course have for its basis, as a remedy for man's sin, the fact of man's need. The character of that need, and its extent, must be a foundation stone in any system of Theology. Mr. Birks finds in man, philosophically considered, an ontological capability of Redemption. He says: (Difficulties of Belief, p. 94) "It is equally clear, that the whole economy of man's redemption rests entirely upon the duality of his being." This is a part of his chapter on the creation and fall of man.

It is a philosophical endeavour to solve a problem of God's moral government, in the case of man, as compared with angels. He regards the simplicity of the being of Angels as an ontological bar to the possibility of their recovery: (Difficulties of Belief, p. 191) but man was created weaker, in order that he might be redeemed. This, of course, is mere speculative assumption, and is of little moment, save as we consider what relation it

ultimately be admitted to the beatitude of Heaven—to those joys which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive." The only difference it would appear, that there is, at present, between Mr. Birks and Canon Farrar, is this: the former does not hold probation in Hades, as does Canon Farrar.

bears to a Theological system and superstructure. He assumes therefrom, that man was created;—that the first pair were so created;—that they were, with all their posterity, overshadowed by a provision of redeeming grace, even before they fell: even as he holds that the atonement has a relative efficacy, for the good of all men, whether they believe in it, or not: That their connection with Christ, as the federal head of the race, forgives the debt of sin, although it does not, without faith, cure the disease: That the curse of the Law is removed, but the curse of the Gospel remains. So, “He is the saviour of all men.” “All men” are still “his brethren.” Therefore, their punishment has still relation to that fact.

He makes that punishment indeed, to be “eternal:” but it is rather a negative, than a positive punishment. They will not, he thinks, be finally restored and forgiven: but it will be a privative punishment of the loss of God’s favour, which they, having merited, will probably finally acquiesce in.

Yet that this even, will be eternal, he is not quite persuaded, as he says, (Vision of the Future, p. 75.) It will be “a loss of the beatific vision, *perhaps* for ever.” Thus, it is, according to Mr. Birks, simply a punishment of character only. This is the main part of his theory. It has however some reference to the doctrine of Original Sin, and is there also, open to grave exception. He says (Ways of God, p. 164) when treating of Regeneration; “But since it is always conceivable that the aversion and inattention, might have been more total, and the obstinacy in evil, greater and more stubborn;

the fact of the change, always must involve a kind of negative goodness, in the want of a greater possible degree of iniquity, which maintains for it a really moral character, and justifies the immense results that are suspended upon it."

This evidently involves semi-pelagian error. So also the distinction drawn by Mr. Birks, between "the death the penalty of sin, and the second death," is utterly without warrant (as I conceive) of Holy Scripture. It rests upon the assumption of Mr. Birks's theological system, that the atonement of Christ, as relatively efficacious to all men, gives them to share, actually, in the benefits of His death; as He is said to have abolished the original penalty, in every case: also it is asserted, that as they share in the Redemptive benefits of the resurrection, so in like manner, that the Second Death, spoken of in Scripture, is diverse from that "death," which is the penalty of sin, and is even curative and reformatory in its character. So, he endorses the saying of Plato, that *all* punishment is reformatory. "Punishment is set before us, in the light of a Divine medicine for the diseases of the soul." "Difficulties of Belief," p. 226. Again, "However terrible and solemn, it is his Divine remedy for all that is most fearful and appalling, in the actual, or possible, evil of a fallen and rebellious universe," p. 222. Thus, the "second death," is curative in its character, different from the "wages" of sin, and the penalty pronounced in Eden, and remedial for it, as for its procuring cause,—*i. e.*, Sin.*

*Thus it will be seen that Mr. Birks holds to a *kind* of Purgatory,

It is to be added that, as he considers the punishment of the lost is a matter of knowledge and contemplation to the redeemed; therefore, not only can it not have that character which is commonly ascribed to it; but also, that probably the beholding of it, may even be necessary to retain the redeemed, in that constant and holy allegiance to God, by which their continued bliss is assured. I will only say that this supposition also, is a fanciful and unscriptural assumption, contrary not only to the moral instincts of mankind, and the hope engendered by Divine grace; but also contrary to Holy Scripture. That we shall be "like Him," "see Him as He is," "awake up after His likeness," together with the whole tenor of Scripture teaching, forbids such a belief.

It is evidently an endeavour, philosophically, to solve a difficult problem concerning God's moral government. But as Mr. Birks does not do so but with, what he considers to be, Scripture authority for his system of eschatology and its theological connections; I shall now proceed to consider those passages which he brings forward, in illustration, or in support of his argument. I have already noticed Mr. Cox's quotation of one passage, frequently quoted by Mr. Birks, viz., 1 Tim. 4: 10. "Who is the Saviour of all men." It is only necessary here to remark, that Mr. Birks's interpretation of this

as do the Universalists and Materialists, but with this difference; that it is "perhaps for ever," that they lose the beatific vision of Jehovah;—and, (we may so infer from this, and from his teaching as a whole) in like manner, that their final deliverance from such purgatory, is also doubtful: *possible*, it may be, or *probable*.

passage, is the chief support which he finds in Holy Scripture, for his theory with regard to the atonement. We may pass on to a second, found in Psalm 62: 12. " And that Thou, Lord, art merciful, for Thou renderest to every man, according to his work." Mr. Birks's position is, that it has reference absolutely to all men, and that God's mercy is shewn to the wicked, even in punishing them; so that such punishment is, to them, not devoid of mercy. What we have to seek now, is the meaning of the passage. Has it such absolute reference to "all men?" I consider that the passage, as the scope of the Psalm shews, has reference specially to God's care, and sustenance of his servants; and therefore that the mercy spoken of, as ministered by Him, is with reference to "every one" of such in particular, if not exclusively; that He who searches the *hearts*, and who by the rule of their sincere affections, judges them, and not according to the strict letter of a perfect obedience to all his commands; will so, mercifully, as by this rule of judgment, keep and preserve them. Not only so, but as it is from their enemies that they need his protection; so, as he judges those enemies also, by a similar rule, and sees them to be deficient and utterly wanting in such a principle; He will consequently, by the same mitigated and merciful, while at the same time just rule of judgment, deal with them, also, "according to their works." So we interpret Matt. 16: 27.

A third passage is Isaiah 24: 15. "Wherefore glorify ye the Lord in the fires, even the name of the Lord God of Israel in the isles of the sea."

First let it be noticed that Bishop Lowth's translation

reads as follows,—v. 14, “But these shall lift up their voice, they shall sing ; the waters shall resound with the exaltation of Jehovah. Wherefore in the distant coasts, glorify ye Jehovah ; in the distant coasts of the sea, Jehovah, the God of Israel.” His note on this place is full of interest. V. 14. “But these—that is, they that escaped out of these calamities.—The great distress brought upon Israel, and Judah, drove the people away, and dispersed them all over the neighbouring countries : they fled to Egypt, to Asia Minor, to the islands, and the coasts of Greece. They were to be found in great numbers in most of the principal cities of these countries. Alexandria was in a great measure peopled by them. They had synagogues for their worship in many places, and were greatly instrumental in propagating the knowledge of the true God amongst these heathen nations, and preparing them for the reception of Christianity. This is what the prophet seems to mean by celebrating the name of Jehovah in the waters, in the distant coasts, and in the uttermost parts of the land, מִרְם “the waters” ; ὑδωρ, LXX, ὑδατα Theod. ; not מִימָם “from the sea.”

15. (“In the distant coasts of the sea.”) For בְּאָרָיִם I suppose we ought to read בְּאָרִים ; which is in a great degree justified, by the repetition of the word in the next member of the sentence, with the addition of הַיִם to vary the phrase, exactly in the manner of the Prophet. אָרִים is a word chiefly applied to any distant countries, especially those lying on the Mediterranean Sea.

Others conjecture **בָּעָמִים**, **בָּהָרִים**, **בָּיוֹאָרִים**; **בָּאָרִים** a **הָאָרִים**, illustrati; Le Clerc.

Twenty-three MSS. read **בָּאוֹרִים**.

The LXX do not acknowledge the reading of the text, expressing here only the word **אַיִלָּם**, **εν ταῖς νησοῖς**, and that not repeated. But M. S. Pachom, and I. D. II. supply in this place the defect in other copies of the LXX, thus: **Διὰ τούτο η δοξα κυριου εσται εν ταῖς νησοῖς τις θαλασσῆς εν ταῖς νησοῖς το ονομα του κυριου Θεου Ισραηλ ενδοξον εσται.** According to which the LXX had in their Hebrew copy **בָּאוֹרִים** repeated afterward, not **בָּאָרִים**.

I think that the version of Bishop Lowth, will commend itself to the intelligent reader, on account of its agreement with the context; and also to the philologist, it offers good and cogent reasons for acceptance. But even did we accept the reading of the authorized version, the context is altogether against Mr. Birks's strained and fanciful interpretation, as it very evidently refers to the *godly* who are so called upon to glorify Jehovah: the *remnant*, whether in the fires of persecution, or in the distant coasts, where they were driven. I may add that Mr. Cox quotes this passage, for the purgatory which he teaches. A further passage is quoted by Mr. Birks, as considered to give support to his theory: *i. e.*, Isa. 57: 66. "For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth, for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made."

Bishop Lowth makes a slight deviation from the authorized version in one paragraph, which reads thus:

“ For the spirit from before me would be overwhelmed, and the living souls which I have made.”

Here, again, I quote from Bishop Lowth’s Notes, verse 16, “ For I will not always,” &c. The learned have taken a great deal of pains to little purpose, on the latter part of this verse, which they suppose to be very obscure. After all their labours upon it, I think the best and easiest explication of it, is given in the two following elegant passages of the Psalms, which I presume are exactly parallel to it, and very clearly express the same sentiment :

“ But in His tender mercy will forgive their sins,
And will not destroy them ;
Yea, oftentimes will He turn away His wrath,
And will not rouse up all His indignation ;
For He remembereth that they are but flesh,
A breath that passeth, and returneth not.”

68 : 38, 39.

“ He will not always contend,
Neither will He for ever hold His wrath ;
As a father yearneth towards his children,
So is Jehovah, tenderly compassionate towards
them that fear Him,
For He knoweth our frame ;
He remembereth that we are but dust.”

103 : 9, 13, 14.

To these, also may be added Mich. 7: 18-19 : where the language is similar, and the scope of the meaning precisely parallel to those passages quoted by Bishop Lowth ; but in all, it has a direct and specific reference to the “ remnant of His heritage,” and to those that fear

Him ; nor can it be said of any place of Holy Scripture that there is not a clear and radical distinction made between His chastisements of His own people, and his judgments upon the persistently sinful and disobedient.

That passage quoted by Mr. Birks from Gen. 6: 3, "My spirit shall not always strive with man ;" is, also, utterly without point in relation to his argument.

It is immediately connected with the shortening of the term of human life ; and that, on account of man's great wickedness, and by reason of his subjection, as is generally supposed by commentators, to Satanic government ; and in the cohabitation of "the daughters of men," with the "sons of God :" *i. e.*, apostate angels or devils. The result of which was, "there were giants in the earth in those days.

So, God shortened the term of man's earthly probation, during which his spirit strives with the unregenerate. But, again Mr. Birks appeals to Holy Scripture ; and here, to Hosea 13: 14, "O death, I will be thy plagues."

But here also the just exegesis of the passage gives no colour of support to his theory : for both the Prophet, and St. Paul, who quotes him, in 1 Cor. 15, is treating of the godly, and of God's dealings with such. And whether it be objectively considered, in the atonement of Christ, which is made over to them, in its benefits, as a royal behest, by Him who has provided for them in His victory ; or whether it be considered subjectively, as to his work in them, by reason of which the fear of death is taken away, and its power broken ; it is the believer *alone* that has any part in the promise referred to.

Isaiah 25: 8, is quite parallel, and has the same exegesis: as it refers to "His people." Hall's Commentary on Hosea, published by Nicol of Edinburgh, and edited by Mr. Sherman, has some excellent remarks upon the passage quoted from that Prophet.

Mr. Birks, in support of his opinion respecting the federal relation of the wicked to Christ, irrespective of faith, and in accordance with his exegesis of 1 Tim. 4: 10, quotes Gen. 9: 6: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed:" and also the Mosaic enactment, (Deut. 25: 3) that forty stripes should not be exceeded in scourging: "lest thy brother should seem vile unto thee." This is intended to enforce his opinion that God will, in a similar way, not only, in some manner show mercy in His final punishment of the wicked; but also, because they have absolutely *some* part and benefit in the work of Christ's redemption, as they are also men, and that He has the relation, to them, of their federal Head. There yet remains one passage more, which is pressed as proof that God has, in some way, through Christ, made provision for a degree of mercy and grace to those who are finally condemned: It is that the love of Christ has a "length, breadth, depth, and height, which passes knowledge." Eph. 3: 19.

When I come to deal with the matter in a final and positive form, I will say more upon this subject; but let me now remark, that in a parallel place, where David is speaking of God's mercy, or love, and describing it in a somewhat similar way, "as the heaven is high above the earth, and as far as the east is

from the west;" (Ps. 103: 12), he confines such mercy and love in that place, "to them that fear him;" and although we are told in Ps. 145: 9, "His tender mercies are over *all* his works;" yet, in such statement, the scope and meaning is evidently restricted to time, and has special reference to creature benefits. So, again be it remarked, and with *this* reference, "He is the Saviour, or benefactor of all men:" but he is so specially, and in a higher degree of salvation and benefit, "to them that believe."

I have now, I think, fairly and correctly stated Professor Birks's theory concerning the Eschatology of the wicked, as it stands related to the Theological position taken by him, in reference to the Atonement, and to kindred subjects; and I have also considered the passages of Scripture by which he supports that theory. I shall, in the next and last chapter, offer a little in a Positive form, concerning the acknowledged difficulties connected with the subject of Future Punishment; and with a special reference to that form of solution which Professor Birks has attempted.

POSITIVE RESULTS.

(A.) AS RELATED TO FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

“What shall we say then”?—Rom. 9:14.

I have endeavoured, so far, to guard the sacred deposit of God's Holy Word, from what I consider to be incorrect views both of its nature and of its teaching: and, in doing so, although I have, upon some parts of the subject under discussion, given what I regard as a correct and positive statement of that teaching; it yet remains for me to express, (1) that view thereof with regard to the nature and duration of Future Punishment, which, I believe, the Sacred Writings most plainly and unmistakably justify; and, (2) to state my view of this subject as it is related to Christian Theism. In thus summing up the result of our enquiries, it will be necessary, first to notice the principle which underlies Professor Birks's theory, as it professes to solve the admitted difficulty; and as it is separable in its character, and as a system, from Universalism and from Materialism. I have, in the details of his teaching, considered what I regard as specifically objectionable; what I now speak of, is the substratum upon which, as a whole, his system rests. His acceptance of the theory of the Trichotomy is an integral part of that system, and fundamental to it. It is philosophical in its character.

It is an endeavour, methodically to demonstrate, the philosophy of God's moral government.* This I regard as absolutely futile ; contrary to the explicit teaching, and allowance of Revelation ; forbidden by all the teaching of Church History ; and irreconcilable with the admitted facts of Catholic Theology. Let us see what does Revelation say, as to the question of such an anatomical process. We might, however, go further back, and say, "What does our intuitive perception of the nature of God say upon this matter ?"

Moreover, does not reason itself, that much slandered and abused faculty, tell us, that the universal and personal cause of all things, more especially of a race of moral agents, must be so immeasurably superior to such agents, as to be beyond their analytical and per-

* I will here notice a gratuitous attack which Mr. White has seen fit to make upon "Popular Protestantism," as he terms it.

"Few things are more wonderful than the slight degree to which modern character is usually influenced by the "indwelling of God's Spirit."

"Again, "Popular Protestantism is strikingly deficient in both logical instruction and a warm poetic environment. Both the intellect and the imagination are torpid, and require the awakening of a new inspiration in faith. They require in a word, a morally credible Christianity, which may take hold of the whole structure of humanity."

One step further—let us help it. They require to learn Logic and Theology from Mr. White and Conditional Immortality !

So, again, p. 506, he says that their doctrine of immortality "will prove itself a veritable flaming sword ;" and again, p. 507 : "For in fact the main position here defended, if successfully established, is nothing less than a *physical and metaphysical demonstration* of the truth of evangelical Christianity." What shall we say ? What of this wonder of the 19th Century ? The system, and its exponent ?

In a similar way does Mr. Heard argue against Natural Religion (pp. 231-38) that because Natural Religion, in the case of the heathen and heathen philosophers, could not elaborate a Philosophical *system* of Theism, complete in all its parts ; therefore there is *no* real light from Natural Religion, no sound, nor valid evidence concerning the Deity : and so also, to the heathen God gave *no* light, and so, no way of salvation ! See also pp. 24 to 28.

fect estimate in relation to the details of His moral government? What reason teaches, our moral sense requires, and faith accepts.

The utterances of Revelation are emphatic. "Canst thou by searching find out God, canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? It is higher than heaven, what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea." Job 11: 8, 9.

So, "Behold God is great, and we know Him not, neither can the number of His years be searched out." Job 36: 26.

So, in like manner, does St. Paul contemplate this fundamental truth, in his Epistle to the Romans. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways, past finding out!" Rom. 11: 33.

So David. "Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters, and thy footsteps are not known." Psalms 77: 19. Also, Psalm 97: 2, "Clouds and darkness are round about him."

So, in like manner, Solomon, 1 Kings 8: 12, "The Lord said that He would dwell in the thick darkness." So, 1 Tim. 6: 16: "He dwelleth in the light that no man can approach unto." What does all teach us? What the language of the *darkness* of Sinai? What the unapproachable *light* of which the Gospel speaks? Moreover, what of "the hiding of his power?" What, also, of the order and method of His Revelation? What of the counsel which for ages and generations lay "hid in God"? What of the punishment of

prurient curiosity, in the case of those who looked into the Ark ? 1 Sam. 6 : 19.

What also of that saying, "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God"? And when we come to experimental knowledge, what does all history and experience of God's people say? What lesson did God give to the tried, the severely tried, Patriarch of Uz? He of whom Jehovah himself testified unto, as "a perfect and upright man"? Did not God point out to him marvels and mysteries insoluble and inexplicable? Did he not emphasize this first principle, "God is greater than man"? Also, what was Job's action upon this appeal? "Who is he that hideth counsel without knowledge? therefore have I uttered that which I understood not; things too wonderful for me, which I knew not." Job 42 : 3. Does not this correspond to the universal verdict of faith? Does not such faith stay upon God in the *dark*? So does Is. 50 : 10, teach. And, moreover, is not such faith always *justified*?

All the facts of Church History go to forbid the vain endeavour to philosophize upon Revealed truth. This needs no argumentation. Every student of such history readily admits it. Philosophy has never helped Revelation, when it has been applied to moral questions. We may say this much emphatically. Of course by *moral*, I here specially intend, doctrinal and religious truth. Philosophy has, so, been the worst adversary that religion has had to do battle with.*

* "The whole doctrine of original sin, its effects and its punishment, we must observe, is but the legitimate drawing out, in statement and consequence, of the true and Scriptural doctrine of original sin. The corruption

But it is also to be added, that the endeavour philosophically to demonstrate God's economy of Future Punishment, and its present connection with His moral government, as Mr. Birks has endeavoured to do, is contrary to the admitted facts of Catholic Theology.

I will but notice three. I might say that the very *fact* of the Divine existence, as a Person, is beyond philosophy, as elsewhere referred to; but can philosophy explain the Incarnation, or the Hypostatical union? Can it solve the article of the Trinity, accepted by all the Catholic world as fundamental?

To these may properly be added another, which, though it may not be said to be one upon which the Catholic world is agreed, does nevertheless furnish an instance additional, that philosophy is inadequate to demonstrate the principles of God's moral government. I refer to the doctrine of Election in its relation to human responsibility. This is another of "the deep things of God," and whichever theory is held, the holder must still say, that it is held simply by *faith*,

of human nature followed deservedly, according to that doctrine, upon the sin of Adam. But the corruption of human nature can only be adequately defined as the loss of free-will and necessary sinfulness; and sin deserves eternal punishment, and deserving it, will, according to the Divine justice, infallibly obtain it unless it be forgiven. The consignment, therefore, of heathens and unbaptized infants to the punishment of hell, extreme result as it was, was but the result of the true doctrine; because in the absence of the only authorized sign of Divine forgiveness, these lay under the full guilt of a sin which deserved such punishment. There was no authority, indeed, for the *positive assertion of the fact* of such punishment; for the *fact* implies that no forgiveness by any other means has been obtained, and nobody can know whether God may not choose to employ other means to this end, besides those of which He has informed us; and if an exception to the necessity of baptism is allowed in certain cases, it cannot be arbitrarily limited; nor does the doctrine of original sin itself at all restrict the means by which its guilt may be removed."—*Mozley on Predestination*, pp. 123-4.)

and not by philosophical demonstration. For this reason I hold it to be entirely incompatible with the admitted facts of Catholic Theology to endeavour to elaborate a philosophical demonstration upon this great practical doctrine of Holy Scripture, as an integral and fundamental part of such Theology. (See "Law on the Immortality of the Soul," pp. 34, 35.)

I will here quote a sentence or two from Law upon this subject. "Reasoning instead of faith, brought about the first change in human nature; no less than a real death to God. And nothing but faith instead of reasoning, can give one fallen man power to become again a son of God. Now to the end of the world, this will be the unalterable difference between faith in God, and reasoning about the things of God; they can never change their place, or effects; that which they did to the first man, that they will do to the last."

It is next to be noted, that a disposition to systematize the teaching of Revelation, has led theologians to make statements with regard to Future Punishment, which I regard as in excess of what may be required, or justified by the statements of Holy Writ; or, by that fact which I have referred to in relation to the nature and operations of the Deity. It may be justly regarded as a primary truth, having for its basis the necessary character of the Deity, and the very fact of Scriptural, or, we may say, intelligent Theism ; that the details of Future Punishment cannot be known.

He who withheld from man for long ages, the *method* of Salvation, and the details of his justification before Himself ; a matter of the most intense and painful

interest to the subjects thereof ; who would have man to rest upon Himself, as Jehovah, for such, and told him to rest upon Him even for the *fact* ; may justly tell man (and may be expected so to do), that, as he has to do with Him, and not with a system of man's wisdom, he must be content with such a measure of light, as to His proceeding, as He may see fit to give. In this connection the doctrine of Original Sin, in its application to those who die in infancy or childhood, and as it stands connected with Law and Gospel, and a Future State ; (if stated Scripturally;) will not admit of being pressed to its logical conclusion without giving us a view of God's character, that the intuitions of our own minds, as well as His revelations, will not justify : This is an *admitted* exception to all rule, upon the subject. So also of idiots. Whatever God has declared and expressed as to his future judgment of His creatures, we may and must implicitly receive, because His expressed will is justifiable, from whatever source we derive the knowledge thereof, as it may authenticate a claim to be from Him : so, Mr. White's remarks (pp. 60, 61),* are, upon these premisses, utterly without

* "Smitten to the heart by the terrific dogma of the descent of the curse of eternal death, in the sense of endless suffering, upon the infant posterity of Adam, these merciful doctors have insisted upon a limitation of the signification of this curse as respects the personally guiltless. The old Roman divines had found in St. Paul's argument addressed to their own church, (Rom. 5:12,) decisive evidence that the death which 'entered by one offence, or by the offence of one, passed upon all men, without any limitation, even as St. Paul declares specially, upon them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.' Whatever reason therefore, there was for understanding this threat in a triple sense, so as to include eternal misery for Adam himself, a point of belief on which no one seems to have entertained a doubt,) there was exactly the same reason for believing that it descended in its direful integrity upon all his posterity.

point. A philosopher, arguing upon terrestrial things, and upon certain and established premisses, might so argue; so also a philosophic moralist who discards Revelation; but no man claiming to be a scriptural Theist, and arguing concerning a being of whom He knows but in part, only indeed so much as that Being sees fit to make known, may presume so to do. "Nay, but O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" So the remarks of Professor Plumptre (Vision of the

The case of infants might be indeed fearful, but there was no loophole of escape for them from the system which embraced in its iron grip the whole race of man. To insinuate that for them the eternal death formed no part of the inherited curse was to break up the foundation of faith in redemption and in the descent of original sin. Accordingly this position was maintained with the utmost firmness by all the Roman theologians, and not less by the Reformers. Augustine had set the example of such firmness. 'It may therefore, be rightly said (says he) that little ones dying without baptism will be in the mildest damnation of all (*in damnatione m̄stissimad.*) Yet he greatly deceives and is deceived who preaches that they will *not* be in damnation; since the Apostle says, judgment was by one to condemnation. (*Multum autem fallit et fallitur, qui eos in damnatione predictat non futuros.*—Opp. VII. p. 142.)

But that which they dreaded as fatal to systematic divinity, has been assailed by our English and American divines of recent times. These affirm apparently without any evidence, except that derived from their own sense of moral fitness, that although the death threatened to Adam himself included the three-fold curse with eternal misery, the curse as it descended on the posterity dropt its most fearful signification, and came upon the human race in its birth only as a two-fold doom, as temporal death, and an inherited corruption of their nature which is termed 'death spiritual.' Thus, it is supposed, all mankind are born, not under sentence of eternal misery for Adam's sin, but only under a corrupt constitution of nature, by which when they come to years, they will incur that sentence by their own transgression."

"The Augustinian system is best defended in its integrity. Take away one of its fundamental definitions, and it falls to the ground.

The recent protestant glosses breathe a compassionate leniency, but they endanger far more than they defend. Augustine and Calvin were solid logicians, and may be trusted in their estimate of what is necessary to the coherence of their theological system." "Life in Christ" pp. 59, 60, 61.

Here be it remarked that we defend the Augustine system, as a rule, "in its integrity." That rule however, as any human rule, or system, we hold to be relatively, not absolutely perfect and true. The reason is found, as asserted in this chapter. See here, also, previous note, with reference to Canon Mozley on Predestination.

Future, p. 18), have *in this connection*, much truth on their side. "We follow the sacramental teachings of Augustine and the mediæval Church until we find ourselves lodged in the conclusion that unbaptized infants are excluded from salvation. We accept the truth that eternal life depends upon our knowing God as He is, until we stand face to face with the dogma that 'all who do not keep the Catholic faith shall without doubt perish everlasting.' We receive the thoughts of grace, election, predestination, until they land us in the *horrible decretum*. We believe that man is justified by faith in Christ, until men press the conclusion, on the one hand that we may continue in sin that grace may abound; and on the other, that millions of the heathen are shut out from hope." So far, just and good; but when the positive is evolved from the negative, as in the case of Canon Farrar, or of the Professor himself, then we protest. The things that God has hid from us, cannot contravene what He has revealed; nor can an unjustifiable and distorted view of the Divine clemency, contravene the fundamental and revealed truth, that "God shall judge the righteous and the wicked." Neither can it, with allowance, explain away, the radical character of Future Punishment, or the express statements of Holy Writ as to its continuance.

The case of infants, children, and idiots, are without the limits of a justifiable argumentation: The same is, at least, *relatively* true of the heathen. We are indeed plainly told that they are subjects of law, although the *same* law will not be applied to them as to others.

They "shall perish without law :" that is, the law of Revelation, or God's Holy Word ; yet they "shall be beaten with few stripes."

That there is *a* probation under Natural Religion is certain : and also, that God has appointed it to them under *that* law : that is, those who so live and die : they are not hopeless without Revelation, nor is God's mercy confined to those who hear the Gospel. This we are justified by facts of Revelation in declaring. All who seek God, under any circumstances, or in any nation, are accepted of Him : His tender mercies are over all His works.

Yet, we send the Gospel to them, because we are commanded so to do ; and because from what we see and know, as well as what we are explicitly told by God, it shall, if received, convey to them greater blessings.

That there will be degrees of rewards and also of punishments, seems clear from Holy Writ.

We have every reason for believing that the Great Assize will embrace all the inhabitants of our globe ; and that although degrees of punishments and rewards may and will obtain, still their nature and character will be, in each case, the same ; *i. e.*, whether applied to Natural or to Revealed Religion.

With respect to the punishment, as also to the reward : it will be primarily and chiefly that of character, but not exclusively.

Neither will it (positively considered) be confined to admission or exclusion from God's presence. The language of Holy Scripture forbids this belief.

The “fire” may not, and it may I think, be presumed that it will not be a literal fire, any more than we may consider that the New Jerusalem shall be paved with gold, or have precious stones for its foundation.

Such language however, describes a Positive reward, and also a Positive punishment. The language, whether of Father Furniss, or of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, or of other imaginative writers, upon this subject, is mingled, I fear, with a “false fire,” when they speak as they do, in certain places.

Yet, withal, Professor Birks’s speculations as to the acquiescence of the lost in the Divine judgment, is without warrant. All we know goes to forbid the idea, either of another probation, or of a possible restoration, or of a qualified hope as to God’s favour being bestowed upon those so at last condemned. Most certainly the system which he has elaborated from Philosophy and Scripture to support such a hope, is utterly without foundation in Revealed Truth.

The argument from **מֹשֶׁן**, and *aiōnios* is not regarded as tenable by Mr. Birks himself, and I think that the evidence given herein is such as utterly to dissipate such a fond illusion, so much relied upon by Canon Farrar, Mr. Cox, and Mr. Jukes, and so much perverted from its just meaning, and misapplied by Mr. White and his *confreres*.

Thus, while we cannot conclude otherwise than that God has declared a punishment, and not an annihilation of the wicked ; so also may we not conclude otherwise than that that punishment is one which all the teaching of Holy Scripture justifies us in believing,

nay, requires us to do so ; that it is to be without end.* To " hope," even, otherwise, is without any certain or revealed basis of hope ; for, although with God nothing is impossible, save what He has ordained to be so, still all that He has revealed goes to forbid man to hope for any good, however remote, or qualified, to those who live or die unreconciled or disobedient to Him. It has been showed, that the eternity of Future Punishment is quite separable from the Manichaean idea of two principles.

The wisdom and power that has created free agents, is not limited in His dealings by the contingency of their actions, upon his commands ; nor can such disobedience and the punishment that He allots to it, at all contravene His supreme perfections from any point of view.

All the evidence that we have, goes to substantiate the truth that God is good to all in this life, and that His tender mercies are over all His works ; but it is ever to be remembered that it is only provisionally so, and

*Mr. Birks says (Ways of God, p. 128) "We cannot reasonably doubt that devils grow more intensely diabolical by long continuance in the practice of fraud and malice. or that the holy angels, by the very habit of obedience to the will of God, gain increasing stability and delight in the way of holiness." See Rev. 10: 20, 21, and 16: 9 as applied to men ; and Rev. 12: 12, as applied to devils. So, (Ways of God, p. 163.) "But when the opposition shews itself by wilful refusal to recognize the power and claims of a truth which conscience feels to be true, the sin is deeper and more dangerous. It is a presumptuous transgression. When this obstinacy continues and grows habitual, and especially when it displays itself under the fullest means of light, it passes into a diabolical malignity of evil, and becomes the sin unto death, from which there is no redemption, and for which the servants of God themselves are forbidden to pray." So Dr. Allon, Vision of Future, p. 367, agrees. Thus we see that there is more than *one* aspect of the law of continuity. So also Scripture corroborates the quotations made above. See Numbers 15: 30; Deut. 17: 12; Ps. 19: 13.

under circumstances of the present; and that such goodness is shown as a powerful premiss in the argument for man's obedience. But, parallel with this, there is evidence also of the "severity" of God, as well as of His "goodness." This is found in the awful fact that by one *man*, and by one *sin*, He has seen fit to allow wide spread and fearful physical suffering, and moral evil to be entailed upon the race, and from which the good also suffer, as well as the bad: the obedient as well as the disobedient. *Both* truths combine to form a most powerful premiss, for the solemnity of that trial which God has here allotted, and to require that the issue of such trial of moral agents shall be of a most grave and awful character.

All known truth in relation to God combines to teach this lesson. God's positive utterances go to assure us of the rich and lasting blessings which shall be conferred upon the righteous when publicly approved by Him as such: in like manner may it be said of His utterances, under similar circumstances, with relation to the irreclaimably disobedient. Some have conjectured that, in the Divine mercy, some hope may lie in a different value of the word *aiώνιος* as applied to them. So, Bengel: and so Mr. Heard, notwithstanding his hypothesis of the Trichotomy, agrees with him, that the doctrine of future retribution is one not to be discussed.*

* Bengel adds that the word *aiώνιος* has two significations is undeniable, and thus the Scriptural expressions *κολασίς aiώνιος*, and *ζωή aiώνιος*, (everlasting punishment, and everlasting life, Matt. 25: 46) seem to have unequal meanings.

Considering also, he adds, 'all that we experience, and that is revealed to us respecting the Divine mercy, we may fairly believe that there is an

(See Tri. Part. Nat. of Man, p. 258, note.) Most certainly God's wisdom here, as elsewhere, confounds man's ingenuity. God gives to all who seek Him, in humble sincerity, every encouragement to believe, and to "wait" upon Him; but to the disobedient He holds out nothing, as such, but a fearful looking for of judgment.

Enough light is given to us in the way of duty; but the path of the wicked is hedged up with darkness; and that darkness which is pointed to in their future, is not by God's Word lit up with one glimmering ray. All that we can learn, is, that "the secret things belong to the Lord our God": that "light is sown for the righteous, and gladness for the upright in heart."

What we cannot now demonstrate of God's judgment with respect to the wicked, viz., that it will be every way worthy of God; saints will yet, and they alone, will believe. The creature must here, as in other great articles of revealed truth, bow before the All-Perfect Creator. To none does He allow a full understanding of this great mystery. So seems St. Paul to say. "What have I to do, to judge them also that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? But those that are without God judgeth." 1 Cor. 5: 11, 13. Of this we may be assured, that in the clearer light of eternity, when the character of that judgment in *all* its relations shall be fully known; as the subjects thereof shall

economy for the poor ignorant heathen, apart from that with which we are concerned. St. Paul does not undertake to give any final decision about them, "what have I to do with them that are without." (1 Cor. 5: 12.) See Bengel's Life and Writings, English translation, p. 376.

then be dumb before Him, and fully admit Him to be in such dealing, as in all His ways, the perfect God; so also, all His Saints and the Holy Angels shall then say, "Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are Thy judgments." Rev. 19: 2.

(B.) ULTIMATE, AND AS RELATED TO CHRISTIAN
THEISM.

We have not yet dealt with the actual issue, involved in this discussion. The question as to the character and duration of Future Punishment, is after all merely a side issue. The *fact* of a future state of rewards and sufferings, is so required by the constitution of the human mind, that it cannot but be submitted to, by the human mind, as a fact. Here, God has not left himself without witness. It has been said that, whether there exists, or has ever existed such a being as an Atheist by *intelligent conviction*, may well be doubted. The force of evidence, both from within and from without, to the evidence of a supreme First Cause, goes to forbid it. Nevertheless, this does not do away with that moral opposition to it, which actually exists in the human mind, and in the human heart. This has been manifest in different ages, in different ways. Deism and Pantheism are the natural results of this condition of man's moral nature. The various corruptions of Christian doctrine and of Revealed Truth are to be traced to the same origin. The distinctive features of Revealed Religion have ever been objected to by men, or else have been dealt with in such a way, that

endeavours have been made, which, by harmonizing them with our human conceptions; their distinctive features, not being *eliminated*; they have been more or less reconciled with our finite ideas of the Deity, and our fallen state and relation, as moral agents, to Him.

The history of the past as to this matter, is substantially the history of the present.

To go back no further, the preaching of the Cross was to the Jew a stumbling block, and to the Greek foolishness. The Saviour, however, in His Person, and His Work, and His Offices, notwithstanding all the development therein given of God's purposes, maintained still unimpaired the primary and essential truth of the character and ways of God, as being in direct antithesis to the character and ways of man.

In the present age, discovery, as the result of research and experience, has put us in possession of many important, though inferior truths. Many run to and fro, and knowledge is increased, yet the wicked do wickedly.

The Nineteenth Century is thought by some to be marvellously in advance of the past. Scientific knowledge is, by some, thought to be capable of solving absolutely all problems, even moral ones. So Huxley, Darwin, and Tyndall would seem to say.

So, a cautious statement of Bishop Butler is pressed into service, as seeming to endorse the position of modern scientists. It is due, however, to Butler to believe that no such conception as theirs, ever possessed him when he wrote those words.

Whatever development natural science may have

attained unto, or may be capable of, by reason of labor and experience of others ; it is to be remembered that there is no developement of the human mind, as to its intrinsic capabilities ; otherwise, men might attain to the knowledge of angels, did not this material fabric, our earthly bodies forbid it : nay, such developement did time permit, might go on, *ad infinitum*.

But if there cannot be such a development of the powers of the human mind ; so, neither can there be such developement of *religious character*, by which, more reasonably, such knowledge of moral questions might be looked, or hoped for. It is very gravely to be doubted whether the faith of modern Christians has excelled that of Abraham : nay, it is doubtful whether it has been equalled. What is true of that quality, is true of others. The fact notwithstanding, however wrongly, or unreasonably, remains : the spirit of the present age, as expressed in connection with this subject, will not receive the principle of an *incomprehensible* Deity. To put it in plainer language, they object to, or will not receive Scriptural Theism.

A comprehensible God ; that is, comprehensible to his creatures, and, so to speak, capable of analysis, would not be the God, either of Nature or of Revelation. Thus it is actually an issue between Theism and Atheism : it goes further than an issue between pseudo scientism and revelation : it is *God, or no God*.

The American representative of modern Atheism, in its present form, has in language fouler and more blasphemous than that of Tom Paine, expressed his rejection and *abhorrence*, of the God of the Bible : nay more, has defied Him.

Mr. White, in more measured, but, in no undecided terms has expressed his rejection of an incomprehensible Deity. Here is the difficulty with all the systems which we have under consideration. Such incomprehensibility, if not rejected, is not maintained: but *apologized* for, and so, modified.

The ultimate issue then, is this:—Is such a quality, as in God, and a necessary, and inseparable element of the Divine perfections, to be maintained unimpaired? That is, is Theism, or Atheism true, and to be maintained?

I have said, in reviewing Mr. Birks's system of Eschatology, that a philosophical statement of the Bible doctrine of Future Punishment, by all the analogy of Revealed religion, is inadmissible and impracticable; I will here enlarge my application of the same principle, and state it in a *more* positive form.

The result of all enquiries concerning the God of Nature, and of Revelation, is identical in both fields of enquiry. The field of Nature contains many acknowledged mysteries. Some links in the chain of causes we are able to trace; but they are the lower links. This must still be held to be true, irrespective of the increase of scientific knowledge. Much of this knowledge also must be regarded as problematical. The science of Geology for instance. But with the largest allowance possible, man knows the God of Nature but in *part*. Here, there are “secret things which belong to the Lord our God.”

With such He bowed Job to submission. What is true in the field of Nature, is true in that of Revelation

also. It is evident, as a historical fact, with regard to Revealed Truth, as we have seen. The method of God's Redemption was "hid in God:" for "ages and generations," God kept back the details so to speak, of that method, while He revealed, to *some*, the *fact*. That fact was progressively developed as such; but when it was most fully made known to man, the same *mystery* which enshrouds the Divine Being, even when His counsels and character are most manifest; is still, as a primary and necessary truth, preserved *intact*, as upon the first page of Revelation.

What is true with respect to Revelation and to Nature, is equally so with respect to experimental religion: the religion which is the result of an objective Theism: that which alone deserves the name. By this religion, as by Nature and by Revelation man is taught to wait upon, to hope in, to depend upon, a personal and perfect first cause. Such is the nature of the schooling which His pupils pass under. It is the schooling of Faith. Intelligent and reasonable faith; yet faith, nevertheless. Such says, as does the Divine message: "Blessed are all they that wait for Him." It is not a science; for that requires proof and demonstration. The Author, as the matter of it, is above science. As it is as pure morality, above mere knowledge,—so the great Author of such morality, —as the cause, must be above and greater than, the effect. The incomprehensibility of God is an admitted fact in the history of His Providence. There is no separation between the doctrine of the Divine existence and this feature of His governance: if one is admitted the other must follow. Here God asserts His Sovereignty:

and also, this essential element of His character. We are, as we are dependent upon God as our Supreme Governor, equally dependant upon Him, for the knowledge of the details of His proceedings to us ward. I say the *details*: because, although He has made known to us the fact, most absolutely and certainly, that He will judge the righteous and the wicked; and, as a fact, certainly, and perfectly; as to the *way* of it, as also as to the *way* of His Redemption and other great truths connected with it, there are secret things which in the assertion of His character, He has reserved to Himself, and which belong not to us. It is not necessary for us to know them, but it *is* necessary for us to *believe* this concerning Him,—which the knowledge we have of Him requires,—that He is both holy, and just, and good. “If we believe *not*, yet He abideth faithful: He cannot deny Himself.” Nothing can countervail this. Nor can one attribute of His character be exalted at the expense of another.

This,—as we may know,—we are required to believe. His utterances require our unhesitating faith, our awe and our adoration; His silence, in view of what we do know of Him, as to anything regarding His dealings and government to usward, must also require our trustful and loyal submission. There is absolutely no alternative for man, as a creature and a sinner, but, so to cast himself upon God, prayerfully seeking and thankfully accepting what he has seen fit to reveal to us concerning Himself, our interests and duty; or, in proud, unhumbled and defiant Athiesm, to reject alike his knowledge and His service.

The existence of such an antagonistic principle and its progressive development as Anti-Christ, we are distinctly told of, and warned against ; and the writer cannot but express his conviction that the culminating point is near at hand, when such a principle as foretold, will declare itself. It is now turning over many to unbelief, and corresponding sin. That a crisis is at hand, is admitted and asserted by both parties in the present controversy.


It is asserted by Universalists and Materialists, from their standpoint, wherfrom, as scientists, or rather pseudo-scientists, and unbelievers in the plenary inspiration of the sacred writings, they look for the supremacy and triumph of their principles. It is admitted and asserted by orthodox Christians, upon the basis of God's Revelation, and of belief therein. Both look for a coming trial of principles. Both look for a *victory*. Unbelief looks for it : so does Faith ; and it is not faith, or unbelief of mere doctrinal principles which, of whatever importance, are still comprehensive of Theism. No, it is Theism, or Atheism : God, or no God. Holy Scripture, as has already been noticed, anticipates this, and warns believers against it.

Forewarned, they are forearmed. Sin and error is not merely of the understanding, but it is a *moral* evil. It is a *cumulative* evil. It will assert itself in absolute unbelief. Here is its terminus, and here is the ultimate and dividing line. "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God."

Whether some who incline to the principles of Rationalism will revert to faith, or go on to the logical issue, is another matter.

An eternal dualism is inevitably asserted. It is that of sin and righteousness, faith and unbelief, Theism and Atheism. This must, ultimately, in the end of man's probation, the probation of the race, be the issue, and the personal result. With one, or the other, he will be ranged.

Such too, has ever, actually, been the personal issue. But let us be assured of this, that whether in His dealings with the righteous, or with the wicked; in His final retributive dealings, the Lord Jehovah will be and appear to all, *confessed* by all, and *adored* by His own :—the all-perfect God. The faith of the godly will then be fully justified, and the folly and ruinous character of unbelief and rebellion will then,—and *only* then,—be justly and truly realized.



APPENDIX.

SYNOPSIS OF AN ARTICLE ON *αιών*.

BY THE REV. JOHN CARRY, B. D.

By the kind permission of the author, I give this valuable article in an abbreviated form. It was published in "The Clergyman's Magazine" for June, 1878, and was decidedly approved of by the "Guardian," and by the "Literary Churchman."

I only regret that I cannot give it here *in extenso*. As will be seen, it amplifies with much ability an argument found in Book I., Part 1, of this work ; and shews that *αιδίος*, and words and phrases equivalent, are used as synonyms with *αιών* and *αιώνιος*, both by Classical writers, by Rabbinical writers, and in the Septuagint and Hebrew text. This satisfactorily and fully does away with the Etymological argument, by which the *Usus Loquendi* is ignored.

I. Classical use.

The author first gives a quotation from the *Timaeus* of Plato, Tauchnitz Edition, Vol. 7, pp. 26, 27, in which he shews that *αιδίος* and *αιώνιος* are used as convertible terms. Also, that Plato says of "past," "present," and

“future”: “All these are the different sorts of time, as it imitates eternity—*aīlōva*.”

Of the hypothetical dissolution of created things, he says:—

“Their pattern is a world, or nature, that exists through all eternity”—τὸ μὲν γὰρ δὴ παραδείγμα, πανταὶ ἀιῶνα ἔστιν ὅν.

In Timaeus Locrus, vol. 7, p. 111, he says:—

“God, the eternal (*aīlōniov*) author of all things, the intellect can alone perceive.” And p. 112: εἰκὼν τῶν ἀγεννάτων κρόνων ὅν αἰώνα ποταγορεύαμες—“an image of the unoriginated time which we designate Eternity.”

“Thus God, τῶν ἀπάντων ἀρχαγὸν καὶ γενέτορα, is *aīlōnios*. And unoriginated time is *aīlōn*.

In Aristotle De Cœlo 1 : 9, we have the following:—

“For the term or end which embraces the time of each one’s life, beyond which there is no natural extension, is called each man’s *aīlōn*, life-time. And according to the same manner of speech, also the end of the whole heaven, and the end of which embraces all time and infinity itself is *aīlōn*, which is derived from ever-(*āei-*) existing.”

“Though this derivation is exploded by philologists, nothing can more clearly express the *common usage* of the word as the equivalent for a proper eternity, and all doubt is removed by the derivation presented.

“And Diodor. Sic 1: 6: ἀπεφήναντο καὶ τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐξ αἰώνιος υπάρχειν—“They held the human race to have existed from eternity.”

II. Next in order comes the Hebrew word בָּרוּךְ.

The author gives the etymological renderings. These signify remote, or indefinite, or hidden time.

He then proceeds to shew, that by the usus loquendi of the Old Testament writers, it came to signify *eternal* duration. (Jer. 51: 39. “That they may sleep a perpetual sleep.

Hebrews—“A sleep of **בָּרוּךְ** **ע** Chap. 28 (LXX.) ὑπνῶσιν ὑπνον
(*olam*), eternity ;” “i. e., for all
future, viz., death.”—Fuerst.

Daniel 7: 14.—“His dominion
is an everlasting dominion, which
shall not pass away, and His
Kingdom that which shall not be
destroyed.”

εξουσία αἰώνιος, ἥτις οὐ παρελεύσεται, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αυτοῦ οὐ διαφθαρήσεται.

Ps. 90: 2.—“From everlasting to everlasting Thou (art) God.” σὺν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰώνος ἕως τοῦ αἰώνος σὺ εἶ.
“Eternity both past and future.”
—Fuerst.

The absence of the copula in Hebrew, and the absolute σὺ εἶ of the LXX., sufficiently attest the proper eternity of the life of God which is meant.

Genesis 21: 33.—“And Abraham called on the name of the Lord, the everlasting God.”

θεὸς αἰώνιος

בָּרוּךְ **ע** (El *olam*): “Eternity without beginning and end, applied to God alone, and always to be rendered *everlasting*.”—Fuerst. So Is. 40: 28, **עֶלְוָהִי** **בָּרוּךְ** (Elohay *olam*), “The everlasting God.” Dan. 12: 7. “Swear by Him that liveth *for ever and ever*.” **הַעֲוָדָה** (through) *the age*, the singular with the article, denot-

ing the totality of duration; and so LXX.: *εἰς τὸν αἰώνα.*

Isaiah 45: 17.—“ Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation.”

עֲזָלָמִים (olamin, of ages, eternities):

“ Ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded, *world without end.*”

עֲדָעֶזְלָמִים יְעָד ad-olemay ad =

“unto the ages of eternity.”

σωτηρίαν αἰώνιον.

ἔως τοῦ αἰώνος ἔπι.

A similar phrase is found in Micah 4: 5, “We will walk in the name of the Lord our God *for ever and ever.*” **לְעוֹלָם וְעַד**, (*l'olam vaed.*) LXX. *εἰς τὸν αἰώνα καὶ ἐπέκεινα.*

“ Let us here observe a very striking and decisive translation of the LXX. In Isa. 48: 12, our authorized version reads, “ I am the First, I also am the Last.” For “ the Last,” the LXX. has **אַחֲרָן** (*akharon*); but the LXX. translate, *πρῶτος καὶ ἐγώ εἰμι εἰς τὸν αἰώνα.* “ I am the First, and I am *for ever.*”

III. We now come to Septuagint uses of *αἰώνιος* to express the longest duration, not in verbal translation from the Hebrew, but in independent phraseology. Job 33: 12. *αἰώνιος γὰρ ἐστίν οὐ ἐπάνω βροτῶν.* “ For He that is above mortals (is) *eternal;* Authorized Version: “ God is greater than man.” Wisdom 4: 1. “ Virtue the memory thereof is *immortal.*” *ἀθανασία.* Ecclus 13: 1. *οὐ ζῶν εἰς τὸν αἰώνα = θεος.* “ He that liveth *for ever*” = absolutely for God.

The author gives also a quotation from 4 Macc.

10 : 15, to shew that there also, *āīdios* and *aīώνios* are used as synonomous terms.

He also notices that “emphasized forms, more complex” are used in the Apocryphal books, and that they contain many more statements of what Mr. Deutsch calls “this damnable doctrine.” I transcribe his remarks upon the use of the words *aīώνios* and *āīdios*.

“If indeed, wherever in canonical Scripture the respective states of good and bad men in a future life, are mentioned together and contrasted, we always found carefully observed the supposed difference between *āīdios* and *aīώνios*, (as in 4 Macc. 12 : 12 where *aīώνios* is used concerning punishment); there would then unquestionably be the greatest reason for considering that difference. But so far is this difference from the mind of the sacred writers, that, as we shall see later on, and as is indeed universally admitted, *aīώνios* of supposed inferior force, is the word customarily and almost technically employed to express the interminable bliss of God’s people. This is a question for those to explain, who insist on the great variety of expression which the Greek language made possible.”

IV. Next in order is the Rabbinical use, and as I cannot quote this in full, I will give the substance of the testimony adduced therefrom.

Mr. Carry quotes from Lightfoot : Hor. Heb. Matt. 12 : 32. Lightfoot traces the phraseology there used : (*οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, οὐτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ, aīώνι οὐτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι,*) to the Rabbinical phrase **הַזֶּה הַלְּבָבָה**, (*olam hazzeh and olam habba,*) noticing that while *olam hazzeh* refers to this life, *olam habba*

refers : 1. To the times of the Messiah. 2. To the state after death.

So also it may be added, it appears that in the mind of the Sacred Writers, *i.e.*, in Matt. 12 : 32, as compared with St. Mark 3 : 28, and Luke 12 : 10, the two dispensations comprehended the *entire and utmost limit* of human probation.

The author quotes from Buxtorf's Talmudical and Rabbinical Lexicon, where "the living God Himself," and "the King of Eternity, עַלְמָם *olam*, are spoken of as convertible terms for Jehovah. Having ascertained that עַלְמָם means, in Rabbinical use, Eternity in the strict sense of the word, the author quotes Daniel 2 : 44, Ps. 77 : 7, 8, 9, and Isa. 45 17, to show that the phraseology there used, is a reproduction of that in the Rabbins. Specially may Ps. 77 be noticed because לְנִצְחָה = εἰς τέλος, is used as parallel with ἀπό γενεᾶς καὶ γενεᾶς.

As Mr. Carry says, "the Hebrew does its best in the way of variety and amplification ; and the Rabbinic, as represented in Buxtorf s. v. עַלְמָם can do nothing better than reproduce the very words in their later and debased forms, and the amplification, *to the ages of ages*—עלְמִיאָה רְלְלְלִמְדִי." So, "It would be well to remember, that these three verses, Ps. 77 : 7, 8, 9, represent with certainty the Rabbinic meaning of "ages of ages," which must be something more than "a twelvemonth or so;" even the עד עַלְמִיאָה of Isa. 45: 17, and the εἰς τὸν αἰώνας and οὐκ ἔσται τέλος of Gabriel, Luke 1 : 33. Now, in these verses of Ps. 77, just quoted, no one can have a shadow of doubt that endless duration is meant,

and yet the Greek translators never get beyond a bare “transcription,” where they were bound to do so, if any uncertainty could possibly attach to their customary phrase. Yet “Salvator Mundi” argues thus: “The Greek language is not so poor that it cannot convey the idea of unbroken time, in terms not to be mistaken. It contains many words by which it might have conveyed these ideas in the most definite and unquestionable way;” and so, when we find Greek translators employing a certain formula to represent several Hebrew phrases, which unquestionably mean “unbroken duration,” we are therefore bound to conclude—what in all the world are we bound to conclude?—why that the Greek formula does *not* mean “unbroken duration!” and we are to “conclude that there is hidden,” in the formula, “*some doctrine of the æons.*”

We humbly submit that this inference is utterly against the *facts* of the case, and would be sufficiently confuted by this present reference alone. This supposed doctrine of æons is as mystic, as baseless, and may perhaps develop into something as portentous as the Gnostic doctrine of æons. We believe that we are not wrong in affirming, that the most imaginative and speculative geniuses of Christian antiquity never had a suspicion of such an esoteric doctrine. Origen, with his well known universalism, his great learning, his keen insight, and his untrammelled theorizing, was the most likely man of all the Church to have made this discovery of the æons. But the discovery was reserved for this remarkable century. Origen has a doctrine of retribution, but none of the æons.

"It certainly does seem a plain case of foregone conclusion against philological evidence. A weighty part of that evidence has been quietly ignored; for the LXX. whence the N. T. phrase is so largely derived, is not referred to by Mr. Baldwin Brown, Mr. Jukes, or Mr. Cox."

V. The New Testament use.

I can here but quote part of the author's remarks, and give them in his own words.

"From the Rabbis, passed over into the New Testament, δ *aiών oύτος* and μέλλων, to distinguish the present life from that which follows the Last Judgment: as, Luke 18: 30, 'manifold more in this present *καιρῷ* and in the *aiώνι* to come, life everlasting.'

"Compare Matt. 19: 28: where the world to come, follows the regeneration, when the Son of man sits on the throne of His glory; and Luke 20: 35, follows the resurrection: (*vid.*, as above, Lightfoot's comment on Matt. 12: 32).

There are few examples of *aiών* used absolutely, in the New Testament; though 2 Peter 3: 18, is a clear instance:—"To Him (Jesus Christ) be glory both now and to the day of eternity—εἰς ήμέραν *aiώνας*." (See above III., Eccles. 18: 10.)

The principal use of *aiών* is in the phrase εἰς τὸν *aiώνα* (*for ever*); of which let us take the following examples, where the use is clear: John 6: 51, "If any man eat of this bread he shall live *for ever*:" because he shares the life of Christ. (see v. 57.) And 8: 35, where we have figure and reality, and where the looser and stricter use, before referred to, are found: "And

the bondservant abideth not in the house *for ever* ; but the son abideth *for ever*."

Luke 1: 33: "The angel says of our Lord, He shall reign over the house of Jacob *for ever*, *εἰς τὸν αἰώνας*, and of His kingdom there shall be *no end* ; *τελος*." The parallelism proves the æons = endless, as the sense demands.

We have a further amplification in *εἰς τὸν αἰώνος τῶν αἰώνων* as in Gal. 1: 5: "Our God and Father: to whom be glory for ever and ever." (Phil. 4: 20.)

It would seem that this formula corresponds with the Hebrew superlative, as in Dan. 9: 24, the Hebrew "holy of holies," is translated in the authorized version, "most holy;" and as in the *Magnificat*, His mercy is on them that fear Him, *εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν* (*textus receptus*) unto generations of generations," *i. e.*, the most distant possible. Winer indeed (sect. 36: 2), and Grimm (Lex. New Testament), regard the form as no mere Hebraism, but as denoting ages made up of ages, and equivalent to the longest possible duration." "In the same book, this formula marks the duration of the punishment of men and devils: 13: 3, "Her smoke goeth up for ever and ever."—ἀναβαίνει *εἰς τὸν αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων*. The present tense, *ἀναβαίνει*, is also suggestive of perpetuity. The authorized version "rose up," is wrong; there is no various reading. In 20: 10, it is said of the devil, the beast, and the false prophet: "They shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." And of the servants of God in the final blessed state, it is said (22: 5): They shall reign for ever and ever."

“*Αἰώνιος* has the same limitations as *αἰών* cf. Rom. 16: 25, *μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰώνιοις σεστιγημένου*, with 2 Tim. 1: 9, *χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ... πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνιων*. Of this limited meaning six or seven examples are found ; but its principal use is to express eternal duration, of which a single example will suffice : 2 Cor. 4: 18, “The things which are seen are *temporal*, *πρόσκαιρα*, (lasting for a season), but the things which are not seen are *eternal*, *αἰώνια*.”

“*Αἰώνιος* (says Dr. Cremer) is specially predicated of the saving blessings of Divine revelation, by which their not being transitory is denoted : cf. 2 Cor. 5: 1 : syn., *ἀφθαρτος*, 1 Pet. 1: 23, cf. v. 25 (and 2 Pet. 1: 11) : *ἀκατάλυτος* ; Heb. 7: 16., cf. v. 17 and 9: 14.” Of those passages, in which, *αἰώνιος*, as qualifying the punishment of the wicked, are quoted by the author, I give the two following : Mark 3: 29, and 2 Thes. 1: 9. Of the former it is said : “He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath *never* (*οὐκ εἰς τὸν αἰώνα*) forgiveness, but is in danger of *eternal sin*,” *αἰώνιον αμαρτήματος*, as all the critical editions now read.

Of the latter “*διτινες δίκην τίσουσιν, δλεθρον αἰώνιον, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἵσχύος αὐτοῦ.*”

“An awful verse ! no idea of reformatory punishment here ! *shall pay the penalty, shall suffer the vengeance*. What an amazing imposition on a Christian’s judgment to ask him to believe, as Mr. Jukes does, that *δλεθρον αἰώνιον* is a “remedial” process ! What a terrible playing with terrible words is this ! *ἀπὸ προσώπου, κ.τ.λ.* is a tremendous exaggeration of

δλεθρον : the power that banishes to destruction, forbids return."

I think it will be generally agreed, by candid readers, that the Author has given us a luminous exhibition of philological *facts*, and not theories. Also, that he has cogently vindicated Orthodox Theology.

I will but remark here, that the special pleading of Canon Farrar, Mr. Jukes, Mr. Cox and others concerning *αιώνιος* and other words referred to by Mr. Cox p. 37, does but furnish another instance of wilful violation of a well known and governing principle of interpretation, viz., a due regard to the *usus loquendi*.

(B)—EXCURSUS ON THE RISE OF MORAL EVIL.

This is a topic very closely connected with the doctrine of Original Sin, as the latter is with that of Future Punishment. The character of that punishment, suggests the enquiry, "Is Evil to be done away with, or, is it to continue?" "If so, why was it allowed of God?" or, "How did it originate?"

The latter question is one which has perplexed the wisest of men, for many generations, but it is again revived in connection with the present controversy. The *destruction* of evil, is demanded by many, as essential to God's character ; and also, it is sought as a demonstrated truth. There is a prescribed limit to all such enquiries, which I have already referred to.

We may not expect such a demonstration as has

just been noticed, nor do I suppose such can be given of the rise of moral evil ; but, as the orthodox belief, is supposed, by some, to favour the Manichean error, I will offer some remarks, which may, at least, serve to shew that it is not open to such a charge. I think, that it may perhaps be shewn, to be consistent with the facts of Revelation, and of experience in relation to sin and temptation, that the entrance of sin, into the world of higher created intelligences, was by a process similar to that by which it entered our own ; although, in the latter case, it was with a superadded moral and personal influence, from without. I will first quote Professor Birks's view of this question, from p. 78, "Difficulties of belief."

"Now, evil viewed in it's widest sense, includes the necessity which underlies the whole universe of the possible, and is a shadowy resemblance of the Divine necessity of being, with no share in the spontaneity of the Godhead. By virtue of its character, it can never touch the Divine nature ; but seizes upon every created being, which might possibly not have been, and attaches to it, as a metaphysical evil, from the moment of its birth, in the form of a necessary limitation, and privation of still higher modes of being. But, in the form of moral evil it cannot exist, since it has nothing spontaneous, or free in itself, till it has allied itself with the freedom of some positive existence.

Now, this can only be, when the Creator, besides creating all things freely, creates moral agents endowed with His own prerogative of internal choice and freedom of will. But this marriage between metaphysical

evil, which is necessary, and the free-will of the creature, out of which is born moral evil, must remain a mystery, different in kind, yet very similar to the mystery of the Divine existence."

Upon page 44, Mr. Birks says that moral evil "is an inseparable result of the creation of free moral agents." I would rather say, "is closely connected with the subsequent history of such free moral agents." But I think that a more satisfactory view of the whole matter may be taken.

We may start with an ascertained and well established premiss, that God is the perfect good, both in Himself, and to His creatures: To *all*, but especially to moral agents. Also, *that all God's works are good, as they originate from Him; but within such a limitation as He has assigned them.* (Compare this with Mr. Birks's statement, before quoted.)

This is true of moral agents, as they stand related to Himself: it is true of the material creation, in the relation that material good,—*properly*,—in itself considered, (including metaphysical, or spiritual, as *distinguished* from material good,) and also, in relation to God's Law,—bears to man. Both, as created, and not self-existent, can be but *relatively* good, and so imperfect.

Both are capable, from their very *nature*, of transmutation; but of *such a* transmutation as is involved in the relations they severally bear to God, and also to each other. Objective material good, in its widest sense, as above referred to; when acted upon by a free moral agent, contrary to the Divine Law of such relation to Himself and to man; may, as so operated

upon by the human will, produce, by reason of such moral impress, marriage and conception; as God has forbidden such alliance, by inherent law of the nature of each, as well as by knowledge of God's command, involved in such Free Agency; *a subjective evil*: Such is sin. So, in its first inception, as afterwards known, and ascertained by dogmatic teaching of Holy Scripture, it is "the transgression of the law."

Created good, whether known or unknown, or of whatever kind, when sought after by a free moral agent so as to contravene the law and love of the Creator; and peculiarly so in the case of angels who had knowledge of God; must, in such case, stamp such a character of evil upon them, as partakes of their own superior ontological qualities.

Thus, moral evil, is not born of metaphysical evil, and moral good, or free agency; but of material, in the sense before declared, and of moral good: *i. e.*, pure or unfallen free agency.

This view appears to me to be fortified by the fact that the culminatory and final condemnation of *men*, arises from a similar determinate preference of material, or created good, (Rom. 1: 21-25) above the uncreated and perfect Good: from whom all creation *proceeds*, as the first cause, and to whom by natural and by positive law, as the proper and controlling good, all such intelligent and moral creation belongs.

Such action as contravenes this law, is, by the whole tenor of Holy Writ, the "sin unto death." Further than this, the express testimony of Holy Writ, as to the abuse of creature good, fortifies this position. The

sin for which the heathen were condemned by Paul, (Rom. 1:) is the condemning sin in all cases. So, God says, (Matt. 2: 2) "I will curse your blessings, yea, I have cursed them already, because ye laid it not to heart." So David says, Ps. 69: 22; so Paul, Rom. 11: 11, "Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling block and a recompense unto them." So, Ps. 106: 15, "God gave them their desire, but sent leanness withal into their soul." The same voluntary, but sinful deflection of man's life from God, was *possible*, under the very highest conditions of created moral excellency. So, as free agents, but by the addition of opposing forces of good and evil in the allotted trial, *man* is still tried; and the just relations of the creature, to the Creator and Benefactor now manifested, justify us in concluding that a perfect unity of principle upon this basis, must ever have been God's rule for the government of free agents.

Why He did *create* free agents, we may not presume to say; but that moral evil, as existent, is traceable to this fact, I quite agree with Professor Birks, although I differ with him, as has been seen, as to the marriage of free agency with metaphysical *evil*.

It does but remain, that we consider the question "Is it possible for a free agent—as an unfallen being,—to be so tempted to a wrong exercise of such free agency?" (That is, aside from any operation of an opposite principle from without, whether upon his senses or upon his mind.)

When we consider the very fact of such free agent, being a creature, and so mutable; of his being a crea-

ture, and so dependant upon the Divine Being for his knowledge, we may see such temptation to be *possible*.

The *possibility* of temptation coming to him from *within*, from the fact of such free agency, and of the limitations inseparable from the creature; (not the *necessity* of such temptation,) is, I think, evident from the premisses. Yet did we admit such temptation to be necessary, as Mr. Birks asserts metaphysical evil to be necessary; it by no means makes *moral evil* to be necessary; nor, as he asserts, “a necessary consequence of the creation of Free Moral Agents.” I quite agree with him in what he says (p. 54,) that “the will of such a creature is neither undetermined nor necessitated by outward circumstances: it is *self-determined*.”

I also agree with him when he says (p. 56), that moral agents can only be ruled by moral influence; and that mechanism, compulsion, and mere physical constraint, are means incompatible with the essential laws of their nature, which Almighty Power cannot, and Infinite Wisdom refuses to employ. *And hence, the supposition that such remedies can avail, when all others have failed, can be nothing else than a mischievous delusion.*”

I have italicized the last sentence.

It must, however, yet be said, that what Mr. Birks has written in the latter part of the same book, goes to modify, if not to entirely contravene, the foregoing utterance, and that he yet inclines to the belief that a *moral*, if not a *physical* force, will qualify, if not disannul, the results of a previous moral trial.

I think it to be quite apparent, upon the premisses

which I have stated, (1) that, as is required by the very nature of the creature, and the free agent, however sinless ; (that is to say, as having a moral nature with no positive bias to sin), that it should be capable of temptation ; so (2) that the nature of the case does not require anything in the shape of metaphysical evil, to produce such a result as moral evil ; because (3) the nature of material, as distinguished from moral good, as it also is imperfect ; so, when it is acted upon by a moral agent, in contravention of the law of supreme love, trust, and homage due to the Creator ; such action must produce *in* such moral agent, the curse attendant upon such deflection, as a generated and inherent moral evil. (4) The knowledge of the creature, as an imperfect knowledge, must require a trust in the supreme and all-perfect Creator ; but if such rightful trust is alienated, and by reason of such character of free-agency, *may* be alienated from them to other possibly existent, if not known objects, then also such deflection of the creature's faith, is moral evil or sin. (5) We may argue, *a posteriori*, that God, as Creator of moral agents, will try them ; and so, that as first created, their very moral qualities, by moral law are made capable of such trial ; and also that, after trial, and by moral law, they are so made, (morally), by confirmation of a holy nature, *incapable* of falling. All we know of God's moral government, enforces this lesson. *

* Mr. Birks's hypothesis (Doctrine of Belief, p. 228,) of the knowledge given to the saints of the punishment of the wicked, and their beholding of it, as *necessary* to their continued allegiance to God, is

The result of all is evident and clear.

Orthodox eschatology gives no support to Manichean error. God did not create evil, although He foresaw it ; but, while as the all-perfect Creator, He could, in His power and wisdom, and consistently with all His perfections, create free agents, under moral law to Himself ; so, when such free agents do, as they *may*, determinedly, under such trial as He in His righteous government has seen fit to appoint them, reject and contravene such law ; He, who so created them under such provisions, is not, by the law of His own being, so limited and necessitated, in the just maintenance of His character and government, either to restore them ; be it by physical or by moral law, which they themselves have before refused ; or, otherwise, to undo, and *destroy* the work of His own hands. Either of these courses would deny the primary and necessary Law of His Being ; *i.e.*, *Perfection*.

altogether contrary to the tenor of Holy Writ. Their established and *tried* holiness, by moral law, and by God's promise, relieves them from all fear of such danger.

(C)—EXCURSUS UPON THE TRICHOTOMY THEORY.

This theory is held by all who hold to conditional immortality; and as upon it they build their system, as distinguished from Materialism, pure and simple; it is worthy of some special attention. We shall see that this system of Psychology, so philosophically elaborated, is open to most grave and serious objections; and like the same principle, as applied to doctrine, not only does not solve difficulties nor *demonstrate* Scripture truths; but it “poisons the stream of God’s word.” What is elsewhere said respecting knowledge of God by Philosophy, holds good here also.

1. In order to establish a foundation for their system they need to have a clear and well ascertained difference laid down in Holy Scripture, between the words **ψέψη**, and **πνεύμα**, **ψυχὴ**, and **πνεῦμα**. Which of these, marks the highest of the three qualities of which man, according to their theory is composed?

This they are not agreed upon; as indeed there are no data in Holy Scripture upon which to ground such a distinction. We need not, therefore, enter further into this enquiry. Such a distinction, as clearly made and defined and so *verbally described*, by the sacred writers, is imperatively demanded as a valid basis. No such basis, by their own consent, can be found. *Ergo*, they, the sacred writers, use the aforesaid words as synonyms of

each other. In proof of this, see Is. 26: 8, 9 : where חַדְרָה, and שְׁפָךְ נָבָת are used synonymously.

2. Having ascertained that their system is without Scripture for its foundation ; we may now see how it contravenes, alike, the laws of sound reason, and also the doctrines of Holy Scripture.

Mr. Heard (page 20, Tri-partite Nature of Man) says: "It is in proportion as men, by attaining to spiritual manhood, and having their senses exercised (by reason of use) to discern good and evil, that they learn what is the organ which discharges the function of spiritual mindedness. We see only half the glory of God's word, if we suppose that the same can discharge two different functions; serve, i. e., as the intellectual instrument of the unawakened psyche, and also as the instrument of religious consciousness when the spirit is awakened and turned to God."

So he says (p. 21): "It is not the psyche that prays." But how will he explain what Paul says, 1 Cor. 14: "My spirit ($\pi\tau\epsilon\hat{\nu}\mu\alpha$) prayeth," as compared with the same act of Hannah, 1 Sam. 1: 15: "I have poured out my soul ($\mathfrak{שְׁפָךְ נָבָת}$), before the Lord ?" Here, no amount of ingenuity can declare that the two words are not synonymous; as they describe the same act, and the same instrument.

But it is also *irrational*. Is it not absurd to say that with one faculty we understand of God, while with another we understand of his works ? Moreover, the faculty of conscience, or God consciousness, as they describe it, and which is identified with the $\pi\tau\epsilon\hat{\nu}\mu\alpha$, by

some of them, and with the $\psi\nu\chi\dot{\eta}$ by others ; requires a knowledge of God which is absolutely denied to the wicked, by God's Holy Word. See Jude, 19. Hence, it would follow that the wicked, according to their Theology, had *no* conscience; but that they say, that the $\pi\nu\epsilon\hat{\nu}\mu\alpha$, or $\psi\nu\chi\dot{\eta}$, or God consciousness, is not absolutely dead, but *dormant*. But their qualified rendering of the word "dead," is utterly subversive of Scripture truth, as to the spiritual condition of men without the grace of God. There is another powerful argument against their theory, from the work of the Holy Spirit upon sinners, as *not* resulting in conversion. They speak of the quickening of the dormant $\pi\nu\epsilon\hat{\nu}\mu\alpha$, or $\psi\nu\chi\dot{\sigma}$, as the work of conversion: what of those whose minds being much informed, their consciences powerfully awakened, and their affections moved so that they are "almost persuaded" to be Christians, yet their *will* does not finally choose God and life ? Does their philosophy as to the quickening of the $\pi\nu\epsilon\hat{\nu}\mu\alpha$, or $\psi\nu\chi\dot{\sigma}$, explain this ? The reason of their formulating such a theory, has its basis in assent to the pure Materialism of Darwin, Tyndal, and Huxley ; and is but a vain philosophical endeavour to harmonize such oppositions of science, falsely so called, with the pure Word of God. So, what Mr. Heard says, (p. 156) is mere special pleading for his hypothesis : viz., that without such a trichotomy as he advocates, man would be *ontologically* incapable of making choice of God and His ways ; whereas the incapacity is not physical, but *moral*. His argument is as follows : " Thus the contingency to evil could only have been avoided in one way, by denying to man the

pneumatical faculty altogether; (*i. e.*, as *he* defines it,) freedom to choose the good and to refuse the evil, is involved in the very definition of what a *spirit* is."

So also, that conscience which he speaks of, (p. 160) "renewed as an active habit," we may, and *do* affirm does *not*, necessarily, include *conversion*. There may be much activity of conscience, and yet the truth may be "restrained (from acting,) by unrighteousness." See Rom. 1: 18. This too, is mere theorizing, and *petitio principii*. In like manner the affirmation made (p. 164) concerning the Divine afflatus at creation as being *temporary*, and contrasted with the gift of the Holy Ghost in regeneration, as being *permanent* and abiding; this, also, is quite unwarranted. The very phraseology of Scripture, *i.e.*, $\gamma\epsilon\pi\pi\alpha\omega$, $\alpha\pi\alpha\kappa\alpha\pi\omega\sigma\iota\sigma$, $\kappa\alpha\pi\pi\eta\kappa\pi\iota\sigma\iota\sigma$, as compared with the statements of the Word concerning man's fallen condition, necessitates the inference that Regeneration restores or reinstates man in God's favour, both forensically by justification; (as both regeneration and justification result from faith;) and actually, by the restoring and renewing man in that image of God which consists in the love and choice of Him, and the which he lost by disobedience. His theory of sanctification, *viz.*, "a *growth* of the $\pi\nu\epsilon\hat{\nu}\mu\alpha$. (p. 217-19,) is open to the same objection. As his statement of regeneration goes far to make it an *ontological change*; so of sanctification: it is an *ontological growth*.

Mr. Heard's exegesis of Rom. 8: 16, "The Spirit itself beareth witness," &c., is open to similar objection. The orthodox and just exposition is, that the Holy Spirit as Comforter, Guide, and as the Spirit of Adop-

tion, resident as such in the hearts of God's children, and who is so referred to in the preceding verse ; (*αὐτὸς τὸ πνεῦμα*, the same Spirit;) bears witness to our mind, that is to our intellect and conscience illuminated and sanctified by Him, that we are God's children. Such is His office as declared by Christ. (See here Stuart on Rom.; in loco.) Mr. Heard's exegesis, as required by the Trichotomy theory, must run counter to this office of the Divine *πνεῦμα in us*; and as conversion is the quickening of the *πνεῦμα*, He who so quickens must dwell in that which His presence quickens ; as, according to Mr. Heard, the *πνεῦμα*, and not the *ψύχος*, is the God-consciousness or distinguishing faculty ; so, the Holy Spirit witnessing, (according to his theory,) cannot be the *indwelling* Comforter, to the mere natural *πνεῦμα*, but can only be understood of the Spirit by the Word of God, not within, but without the man : and so also, to the *πνεῦμα* of that man, not as a dead or dormant *πνεῦμα*, but as renewed by the Spirit of God. Hence it cannot properly be said to be "*τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν*"—"to *our* spirit"; that is, according to their theory; whereas, by the context we learn that it is the two principles within the man, of which St. Paul speaks, and the existence of which is peculiar to the *regenerate*.

Stuart, as quoted above, properly translates *τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν* as "with, or to, our *minds* :" making *πνεῦμα*, *ψύχος*, and *νοῦς*, synonymous terms, as they really are.

I have elsewhere shewn that the Trichotomy theory affects the doctrine of original sin, so as to require

Semi-Pelagianism. Hence Mr. White's assertion "erroneous Psychology, erroneous doctrine," is here, not "a sword with two edges," but a sword against them only. In a similar way, Mr. Heard's theory to explain the sanctification of those called late, is more than a harmless conjecture: it leads to the Purgatory of the Romish Church.

His notion as to the mystery of the Trinity is mere speculative philosophy: and so of the resurrection body. With respect to the question of Traducianism and Creationism; the Trichotomy theory does *not* solve it, because, in the case of the unregenerate, it does not touch the difficulty. The entire man is propagated *ex traduce*, according to the Traducian hypothesis; while, according to Mr. Heard, it is only in part, and the pneumatical faculty is imparted at creation by God: but, *per afflatum*, and not *per spiritum*. This is to avoid the difficulty of the Creationist hypothesis, which would make God the author of evil. This afflatus of the *πνεῦμα* at creation, similar to the first act of God when Adam was created, is renewed at every birth: if the *πνεῦμα* is quickened, and the man made pneumatical, he is so made immortal: if not; first the body and soul, and lastly the spirit dies, and the man is annihilated. This hypothesis, however, (as to *per afflatum* and *per spiritum*,) as has been seen, is contrary to the Scripture teaching concerning regeneration: and so all falls to the ground as a mere scholasticism, as it truly is.

Mr. Birks feels the same difficulty, but seeks to evade it in a different way, (Difficulties of Belief, p. 151), by

saying that it was a *wilful* act of disobedience in the case of Adam and Eve; but a sinful will, cannot so be propagated to their descendants: thus, the personal and condemning sin of a perverse will is afterwards *acquired*. This, he endeavours to prove that young children cannot have. It is part of his theodicy, as to the atonement, that sin is both a “debt” and a “disease”: Christ’s work does away with the former, in *all* cases.

The “disease,” is that of which men *will* not be cured, though they *may*.

The harmlessness, innocence, and ignorance of little children, as referred to in the passages of Scripture quoted by Mr. Birks, is relative, not absolute, and in no way militates against the Scripture doctrine of Original Sin, as it applies to *them*, that they “are very far gone from original righteousness, (*“quam longissime distet,”*) and of their own nature, are inclined to evil.” The corruption of the *will*, is no less certain and real, in their case, than in that of the adult. The acts of the will may, and must be, as conformed to the measure of intelligence, less positive, and numerous; but not less truly do such acts, in accordance with a nature alienated from God, take place.

“Even a child is known by his doings, whether they be pure, or whether they be right.” Prov. 20: 11. The acts of the will, in the case of the adult, as more developed, and based upon more knowledge of God, are proportionately culpable: by the operations of the same moral law of character, such acts become a *habit*, unless controlled and subverted by a superior moral

law, which the moral agent, freely, though not without the aid of sovereign grace, chooses and obeys.

Otherwise, the corrupt tree, by the law of its own nature, brings forth corrupt fruit.

The "sin unto death," is but the same in kind,—as it culminates and develops,—as it was in embryo. The will, together with the other moral faculties, is equally corrupted with them, from first to last.

The true solution of the supposed difficulty is to be found in another way. Like God's sovereignty and man's free agency, both (*i.e.*, Traducianism and Creationism) are true.

As Pantheism would do away with the Divine Personality, and make the known laws of nature to be nature's God; so of such arbitrary and one-sided theories. God has both physical and moral laws, by which He governs the universe, and their limits He has defined. Within these limits they are His voice. But we know not all of them. He is in them and above them, because prior to them. Much more to us. We have seen that the same is true as to the rise of moral evil. God was not the author of it, although He foreknew it.

He in His wisdom made law, and under its provisions allowed a free moral agent, whom He had so created, to transgress it. He did not, and does not, compel; neither does He do so, now here.

All things wait upon Him, the perfect Jehovah. Man has indeed, as a free agent, destroyed himself; but there is yet, free and ready help in God.

ADDENDA.

The work referred to on page 153, is by Joannes Vorstiuz, who, I find, was a Hollander, not a German.

It was first published at Leyden in 1658; it was republished with the addition of a second part, in 1665. The last edition was published at Frankfort in 1705.

Winer refers to it as at the head of all previous works of the kind. His own work, it would appear, has practically superseded it. On account of some defects in it and all other existing works of the kind, he considers that "a new work on the Hebraisms of the New Testament is much needed." Thus, in Winer's opinion, his own great work on the Idioms of the New Testament does not fully meet the want.

I transcribe some passages from Winer's Grammar of the New Testament Diction, as ratifying some remarks of my own upon the subject.

"It may be seen from these observations, that in the New Testament there is a two-fold Hebraism, the one *perfect*, the other *imperfect*.

"Under the former we include such words, phrases, and constructions, as belong exclusively to the Hebrew-Aramæan language, and therefore were transferred from the latter directly into the Hellenistic idiom, which is the diction of the New Testament.

"Imperfect Hebraisms we denominate all words, phrases, and constructions which, although found in Greek prose, have probably been transferred from the Hebrew-Aramæan vernacular language. This would seem to be the case, partly because the latter was more familiar to the writers of the New Testament,

and they cannot be supposed to have had a perfect knowledge of the written Greek language; and partly because the words, phrases, and constructions were more common in Hebrew than in Greek."

"It is thus also evident that all Hebraisms have not been unconsciously introduced into the language of the Apostles, (Van der Honert *Syntax*, p. 103). They were *obliged* to retain religious expressions (which constitute the greatest part of the Hebraisms of the New Testament), because they were closely connected with the religious ideas themselves, and Christianity was to be appended to Judaism.

"Besides, the Greek in itself offered no symbols of the deep religious phenomena which the religion of the Apostles unfolded." (I would call particular attention to the two last sentences.)

"Many Greek words are used by the New Testament writers with a very direct reference to the Christian system, as technical religious expressions: so that, from this arises the third element of the New Testament diction, viz., the *peculiarly Christian*. See Clear de Stylo New Testament, p. 380, ed. Schwartz. Compare especially the words ἔργα, πίστις, πιστεύειν εἰς χριστόν δικαιοῦσθαι, εκλεγέσθαι, οἱ ἐκλεκτοί, οἱ ἀγιοι (for Christians) ἀπόστολος, the construction εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τινα (without account of the thing), the appropriation of the term βάπτισμα to *baptism*.

"However, most of these expressions and formulas are still found in the Old Testament and writings of the Rabbins. It will therefore be difficult to prove that anything was introduced by the Apostles peculiar to themselves. This Apostolic idiom is confined rather to the sense of words and phrases, and lies on the surface of philology."*

* Winer's Idioms. Agnew & Ebbeke's Ed. Part I. and III., pp. 34, 36, and 37.

